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Foreword

Wales and language have been entwined for centuries. When an indigenous language is in close geographical proximity to a majority language of power and status, then language itself is almost guaranteed to be a matter for daily discussion. As the language of an imperial power, English has strong historical associations with notions of invasion, colonisation, civilisation and assimilation. Cheek by jowl with an ancient Celtic tongue, comparisons are inevitable, occasional confrontation is unsurprising but, increasingly, the advantages of dual communication are also recognised and debated.

Welsh has been the historic language of Wales, not merely as a means of communication, but as a transmitter of culture and culturally-associated values, as the language of religion, and as a force that binds communities. Its place in history is thereby assured. But its place in modern society has been contested: economically, technologically and politically. Nevertheless, there is now a real possibility that formal and informal language planning are succeeding to stave off a persistent downward language shift and to revitalise the language.

In addition to its role in communication, cultural transmission, community life and education, the Welsh language plays a major role in the definition of Welsh identity. However, the relationship between the Welsh language and Welsh identity is both complex and contested. The examples of Scottish Gaelic and of Irish show that a Celtic language is not essential to establish an identity; for example, many Scots acquire a loyal Scottish identity without speaking any Gaelic. However, there is possibly no stronger marker of identity for Welsh people than speaking Welsh. While Welsh people can and do acquire a Welsh identity through other means, such as sport or music, it is an untypical person who does not feel Welsh from speaking the Welsh language.

The Welsh language and Welsh identity also connects with Wales as territory. For example, in the 20th century, a host of pressure and protest groups, of language movements and campaigns, asserted the right of Welsh as the country’s indigenous language to survive and to thrive within its heartlands. Language rights were claimed to derive from territory. The language was inextricably bound to the land.
Since the Second World War in particular, additional languages have joined Welsh and English as languages heard regularly in Wales. Scattered speakers of Cantonese, Cardiff's Somalis, older and more recent settlements of Polish speakers are just a few examples of speakers of other languages that can be heard in particular locations and domains.

For monolingual English speakers and bilingual speakers of Welsh and English, the additional languages of Wales pose a conundrum. If the right to speak Welsh is a territorial one, what rights do languages have that belong to territories in lands afar? If Welsh speakers claim the right to use Welsh because it is part of their landed heritage, do speakers of other languages have any rights to use those languages in other than their own territory?

A linked but separate issue arises with the choice of language in formal education. If bilingual education is justified and successful for bilinguals in Welsh and English, is it justified for those who speak other languages? If a distinction is made between ‘indigenous’ and ‘additional’ languages (as there tends to be in EU politics), on what basis can there be different policies and practices for different language groups?

There has been a worldwide ethnic revival of interest in languages in recent decades. From the 1960s, ethnic languages have increasingly been supported on the grounds of equity and justice. For some, the rise of interest in minority languages derives from moves away from nation-states and nationalism and is a reaction against the negative attitudes to minority peoples, religions, cultures and languages that scarred Europe before and during the Second World War. For others, the roots of ethnic language revival lie in the Civil Rights Movement since the 1960s, with its understanding of inequality, racism and human rights that now encompasses language rights for minority groups and individuals. In the specific European context, the same period has witnessed an extensive growth in Europeanism, encompassing the broad dimensions of politics, business, sport, education and culture including, not least, a growing interest in the many languages of Europe.

Another recent argument for preserving and revitalising ethnic and minority languages, irrespective of whether or not they are indigenous, has been articulated by environmentalists. Their contention is that ecological diversity is essential for long-term planetary survival. All living organisms, plants, animals, bacteria and humans survive and prosper through a network of complex
and delicate relationships. Damaging one of the elements in the ecosystem can result in unforeseen consequences for the whole system. Evolution has been aided by genetic diversity, with species adapting genetically in order to survive in different environments. Diversity contains the potential for adaptation. Uniformity can endanger species by stifling flexibility and adaptability. Linguistic diversity and biological diversity are seen as inseparable. The range of cross-fertilisation becomes less as languages and cultures die and the testimony of human intellectual achievement is lessened. In the language of ecology, the strongest ecosystems are those that are the most diverse. That is, diversity is directly related to stability; variety is important for long-term survival. Our success on this planet has been due to an ability to adapt to different kinds of environment, both physical and cultural, over thousands of years. Such ability is born out of diversity. Thus language diversity and cultural diversity together maximise the chances of human success and adaptability.

Such ethnic revival and environmentalist arguments pose a conundrum for Welsh speakers. Should all languages be treated equally? Can that only be in principle rather than in practice? Should there be a distinction between the treatment of indigenous and ‘additional’ languages? Should languages be accorded different rights according to whether or not they have a territorial base?

In the end, the answers are not about language: they are about politics. In order to appreciate debates and arguments about languages, an understanding of how language and politics interrelate is essential. In the same way, there can be no understanding of bilingual education at a policy level unless the underlying politics is understood.

There are underlying debates about pluralism and assimilation, about maintaining diversity and social integration in society, about commonality and cohesion, self-determination and social control, and about devolution and fragmentation. The debate is complex and kaleidoscopic, even internally conflicting on occasion. The needs of individuals, their rights and freedoms, can be set against the needs and rights of groups of language speakers; centralisation of authority in language decisions is set against a liberal democracy that allows local variation. Unfortunately, these controversial waters can become polluted with a mix of stereotyping, prejudice, racism and xenophobia.
There is also passion and emotion, deep-seated longings and rootedness in family and ethnic histories, as well as a variety of ideological beliefs, aspirations and anxieties.

The papers in this issue illustrate and illuminate these debates. The treatment of Welsh first language speakers, Welsh second language speakers, recent ‘immigrants’ from across Offa’s Dyke, across Europe and across other continents is explored, with a particular emphasis on school education and an ever-changing National Curriculum. The needs and fears of bilinguals and multilinguals, the nature of additive rather than subtractive language experiences, the difference in language needs between those who speak English as a first language and those for whom English is an additional language, are all included. Beneath the surface lies the varying politics of assimilation and diversity, of integration and segregation, of heartlands and types of language communities, of diverse or compliant provision, and of positive or negative discrimination.

What is important in such debates is to separate out those children who speak English as a first language, a language of international status and power, and who will never lose fluency in that language, and those for whom their first language is a minority language, indigenous or not. The two groups have different needs, due to differences in the power and status of the respective languages. By contrast, the chances of retaining a minority language are never great, partly due to the continuing march of English across the globe. English speaking children learning Welsh are not going to lose their English, while children learning English may lose their minority language in the short or longer term. The status and power of those languages are different: educational treatment has to adjust.

To conclude with a question rather than an answer. One of the occasional claims made for bilinguals and multilinguals is that they are more tolerant of diversity. Given that they speak two or more languages, will often have two or more literacies, and will sometimes operate biculturally or multiculturally, then are bilinguals and multilinguals more ready to accommodate other languages, other cultures, other viewpoints, and accept variety and diversity? The stereotypical English monolingual is often unfairly portrayed as believing that only one language is needed in the world, that Anglo-American culture is sufficient in itself, and that literacy in English is all-sufficient. The naive view is that this leads to a lack of interest in other languages and cultures, and in
promoting diversity in the language curriculum. However, if there is even just a small grain of truth in this simplistic depiction, then could it be that in a bilingual 21st century Wales we can celebrate and not feel challenged by language diversity?

Wales leads the world in language planning and in bilingual education. Can we also develop the maturity to lead the world in believing that bilingualism is not the confusion of Babel but that speaking in tongues is a gift? Is this not a communication, cultural and cognitive gift that should be shared among English monolinguals, Welsh first language speakers, Welsh second language speakers and those for whom Welsh and English may be a third or fourth language? Is not that the basic principle? Or are dominant politics and daily pragmatics too strong for such a language to be politically understood? Perhaps only for this moment.

Professor Colin Baker
College of Education and Lifelong Learning
Bangor University
1. Minority ethnic additional language learners in Wales

Jonathan Brentnall

Abstract
This article provides an overview of the situation of minority ethnic additional language learners in Wales. It begins by presenting some background information on the diversity of Wales’ population and recent evidence on educational attainments. It goes on to examine additional language learners’ educational and linguistic needs before discussing some of the main issues about supporting additional language development with reference to funding and models of provision. The paper concludes that, in order to meet the needs of pupils across Wales effectively, a shift towards more high quality training for mainstream staff is required coupled with greater consistency in the best practice models of provision.

1. Ethnic diversity in Wales
Wales has a long history of ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic diversity from its earliest Stone Age peoples, through the various Celtic tribes, Romans, Vikings, Anglo-Saxons and Normans, to the many Irish, Jewish, Roma Gypsy and continental European people who made this nation their home prior to the 20th century. During the last hundred years or so, this diversity has continued to be enriched by people from other parts of Britain, Ireland and many other countries around the world.

The geographical distribution of different ethnic groupings in Wales is largely a result of historical, political, economic, familial and social factors influencing settlement patterns. For example, in the past many Somali and Yemeni merchant seamen settled around the docks of Cardiff and Newport; Italians set up temperance bars, cafes and ice-cream parlours in the valleys of south Wales (Williams, Evans and O’Leary, 2003); and Bangladeshis who came to the country during the
1960s and 70s have been joined later by other family members. More recently, Filipino medical staff have come to work in Welsh hospitals and skilled migrant workers from European accession countries have moved to towns and cities right across Wales to take up employment. Asylum seekers and refugees fleeing persecution, environmental catastrophes and war in their countries of origin have also been dispersed more widely around Wales.

Throughout the years, many people from different racial and ethnic backgrounds have integrated with existing Welsh communities, mixed socially and established relationships. In the 2001 National Population Census, the ‘Mixed’ category for racial/ethnic classification was the second largest minority grouping in Wales after ‘Asian’ (ONS, 2004), suggesting a high level of social mixing and acceptance between people of certain communities. However, others moving into Wales have found it more difficult to integrate with Welsh society, some experiencing considerable discrimination and inequality (Scourfield et al, 2002). Many migrants have retained aspects of their original cultural, religious and linguistic heritages, passing them on to their children and enriching the diversity of Welsh culture and society. Others have lost many aspects of their ancestral heritages.

The largest visible minority communities have become established in the large towns and cities of south Wales. Although most multiethnic communities in Wales comprise people from a wide range of different backgrounds, and demographics are constantly changing, some communities have a predominant minority grouping such as those of Bangladeshi heritage in Swansea or Pakistani heritage in Newport (WAG, 2007a).

Altogether, approximately 23,0001 children and young people from a wide range of ethnicities other than White British/Welsh are represented in the school population of Wales (WAG, 2007b), bringing many aspects of diverse

---

1 This number is drawn from the Pupil Level Annual School Census 2007. However, the ethnicity of all children and young people in Wales is not yet accurately recorded in PLASC. Data submitted by LEAs for Minority Ethnic Achievement Grant submissions in 2008 indicate that the total is closer to 27,500.
cultural, linguistic and religious heritages to their schools and communities.

2. Ethnicity and attainment

2.1 Patterns of attainment outcomes by ethnicity
Recent figures show clear disparities of educational outcome in the grouped attainments of pupils of different ethnic backgrounds in end of Key Stage Statutory Assessments and GCSE examinations (WAG, 2003a; NAFW, 2006a; 2006c; WAG, 2006; WAG, 2008a).

The study by the English as an Additional Language Association of Wales (EALAW) (WAG, 2003a), Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) data for 2005-07 (NAFW, 2006a, 2006c; WAG, 2008a) and an analysis of a sample of minority ethnic students in secondary schools in Wales (WAG, 2006) found that, when grouped by ethnicity, figures for White British, Chinese, Indian and Mixed White/Asian heritage pupils were generally on or above the national average in the Core Subjects, although there were differences between Key Stages, with Chinese heritage pupils having the highest figures overall. The percentage of pupils of Black Caribbean heritage attaining the expected levels generally declined through each Key Stage compared to other groupings until, by KS4, their figures were well below the national averages. Percentages of pupils of Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Somali and Yemeni heritages were well below national averages across all Key Stages but with varying gaps between these groupings. The majority of pupils from these four groupings are those for whom English is an additional language. With some variation by Key Stage, the lowest proportions of pupils attaining the Core Subject Indicator\(^2\) (CSI) overall were Black African, Mixed White/Black African or Caribbean and Bangladeshi (WAG, 2006; NAFW, 2006a; WAG, 2008a). Though not included in the national figures in Wales, figures from England (DfES, 2006: 39-46) indicate that Roma Gypsy and Traveller children and young people are amongst the lowest achievers of all.

\(^2\) The CSI is the proportion of pupils attaining an 'average' grade in Mathematics, Science and either English or Welsh (first language) in combination.
More complex analyses of data, for example by ethnicity and gender or ethnicity and socio-economic background, reveal a more specific picture of which pupils are achieving well and which are not and, consequently, where some of the greatest needs lie. Differences in attainment by gender are markedly different for some ethnic groupings. For example, the gap between Pakistani heritage boys and girls in 2005 was 22.5% for 5 A*-C GCSEs (more than twice the national average) and 17.3% for the KS4 CSI (almost 3 times the national average). Girls of Black origins were 3.3% behind boys in the KS4 CSI (NAfW, 2006a).

A range of factors including family poverty, parents’ levels of education and literacy, pupils’ prior education experience, low teacher expectations, racial and religious discrimination and undifferentiated curriculum provision (Ofsted, 1999; Gillborn and Mirza, 2000; WAG, 2003a; DfES, 2005; WAG, 2007a) all impact on achievement and contribute in different ways to variations in attainment levels. Experiences vary between individuals, ethnic groupings, areas of Wales and even between schools but certain factors have a greater impact on some groupings than others.

For example, much higher percentages of people from some backgrounds experience socio-economic disadvantage (SED) so the impact of SED on their community as a whole is more significant. In 2006/07, the national average Free School Meal (FSM) entitlement for Wales was 16.4%. The figure for White British/Welsh pupils was on the national average. Indian and Chinese heritage pupils’ figures were lower but Pakistani and Bangladeshi heritage groupings were much higher at 23%. Black and Mixed Black/White heritage groupings were at least 29%. Black African, Roma Gypsy and Irish Traveller heritage groupings were all over 50%.

It is important to ensure that the most accurate data available is used when considering differences in attainment by ethnicity and that as many contributing factors as possible

---

3 FSM is used as the main indicator of SED in the school population. There are other more complex measures of SED such as the Multiple Deprivation Index but detailed information relating to all pupils is not comprehensively available.
are taken into account. Otherwise, there is a danger of drawing misguided conclusions about attainment patterns.

### 2.2 Additional language proficiency and attainment

One of the most significant and constant factors impacting on pupils whose first language is not English or Welsh is their 'level of proficiency' in the languages of education. The EALAW study (WAG, 2003a: 16) found a highly significant association between the level of proficiency in English as an Additional Language (EAL) (as assessed using the All Wales EAL 5 Stage model) and attainment in curriculum tests and examinations, revealing a clear correlation between higher levels of proficiency in English and higher attainment in English-medium schools.

In England, DfES analyses have found that, on average, EAL pupils have lower attainment than pupils whose first language is English although the gap in attainment narrows between KS1 and KS4 (DfES, 2005: 13; DfES, 2006: 61). Value-added results also show that EAL pupils make better progress than English first language pupils over time although many make insufficient progress to close the attainment gap altogether by the end of KS4. This progress is attributed to an increase in their proficiency in English:

... their relative improvement is likely to be due to their increasing fluency in English, allowing them to start to narrow the achievement gap by improving at a faster rate than other pupils with similar prior attainment (DfES, 2005: 11).

In Wales, there is little researched information on the attainment of additional language learners in Welsh-medium and bilingual schools but, based on the above findings about EAL proficiency, one would expect that level of proficiency in Welsh would have a similar impact on academic attainment in those contexts. The better the provision pupils receive to develop Welsh and English the more likely they are to catch up with their peers.

---

4 It is worth noting that 'ethnicity' is not a causal factor. It is a characteristic by which the population can be divided to compare the experiences of different identity groupings in society and to determine where inequalities exist.
3. The educational needs of minority ethnic additional language learners

3.1 Educational, social, cultural and religious needs
The educational needs of minority ethnic additional language learners are much broader than just those pertaining to language. Although many needs are common to all pupils of majority and minority ethnic backgrounds, from person to person the range and extent of social, academic, cultural, religious and linguistic experiences varies considerably.

Minority ethnic additional language learners may have very different levels of familiarity with the social, cultural and religious experiences of the majority of people in Wales. Some will observe cultural or religious customs that affect their lives in and out of school. They may come from wealthy or poor, well-educated or poorly educated, families. Some pupils will go right through the education system in Wales from nursery school onwards, others will join at a later stage and some will have gaps in their formal education. Those coming from abroad may have had considerable prior experience of formal or informal education and others may have had none at all. Some may arrive unaccompanied in the country and need to be looked after by the Local Authority. Others will have very strong family and community support. Some recently arrived pupils may have undiagnosed medical conditions or Special Education Needs (SEN) and some, particularly asylum seekers and refugees, may have experienced physical, emotional or psychological trauma.

Whatever their background, all children and young people need to feel completely accepted and valued as part of the school and the local community. Teachers and other support workers need to be aware of any cultural, religious and social differences between the life of the school and that of the child’s home life, which may present difficulties for the child. Whatever their previous experience of schooling or of the languages of education in Wales, minority ethnic additional language learners are likely to be at a disadvantage in relation to a national curriculum that is culturally framed and based on ‘normative’ age-appropriate progression in learning and
‘native-speaker’ language development. Schools and teachers have a responsibility to identify what prior skills, knowledge and understanding additional language learners bring with them and draw on this in their learning. They should seek to find ways in which the contribution of each child can enhance the life of the school. All school staff need to be alert to the possibility of social isolation and racial discrimination. The extent to which all of these matters are taken into account will have a big impact on a pupil’s progress and success in school.

The considerable variety of pupils’ personal experiences and circumstances means that there is no one-size-fits-all or quick-fit approach to meeting needs. Long-term differentiated mainstream or targeted additional support is often required. Effective partnerships between pupils, parents, schools, communities, LEA staff and other agencies such as health, social care and law enforcement are needed.

3.2 Linguistic needs
Like all other pupils, the 20,000 or so school pupils in Wales whose first languages are not English or Welsh need to become as linguistically proficient as possible in these languages in order to meet the demands of the advanced academic discourses required for the top grades in examinations. High levels of language proficiency will also increase their social capital and their opportunities for social mobility in Wales, the UK and abroad.

Pupils attending English-medium schools need to learn English in order to promote academic learning across the curriculum and they need to learn Welsh both as a curriculum subject and in order to broaden their range of employability skills. Those in Welsh-medium and bilingual schools need to learn Welsh for academic purposes in a range of curriculum subjects but they also need to become as proficient as possible in Welsh and English to ensure they are not disadvantaged in further or higher education, employment and wider social life.

When they enter the school system in Wales, additional language learners already have an internalised knowledge of their home language and, depending on their age, a conscious awareness of the ways different languages are constructed and used to realise meaning.
However, individuals’ linguistic experiences can vary considerably. Some pupils have no previous experience of English or Welsh when they enter school. Others have been taught some English as a foreign language in their country of origin. Many, who have been born and brought up in this country, have learned a language or languages other than English or Welsh before starting school and continue to use these languages with family, friends and in other social contexts. Some are orally fluent but not literate in their home language/s; others are both orally fluent and literate in their home language/s. Some engage with several different languages for social, academic, religious and entertainment purposes. For example, a child may speak a Punjabi dialect with family and friends, read and write Urdu in the local community or mosque, read the Qu’ran in Arabic and understand Hindi in films they watch on satellite TV or DVD.

The bilingual status of Wales and its bilingual education system present a unique set of challenges for additional language learners. At whatever age they start their life in Wales, pupils whose first languages are neither English nor Welsh will have to learn two new languages in addition to their existing repertoire. The curriculum will be taught through one or both of these languages and, in many cases, there will not be a teacher who can speak the child’s home language to interpret and explain what they don’t understand. In most schools, the child’s home language will not be spoken by the majority of other children and young people and will not be supported through extensive use in public arenas outside school or in the media. Only with same-language friends, family and in certain community settings will

---

5 In secondary schools, they also need to learn a Modern Foreign Language (MFL). Although the knowledge gap between them and their first language peers in relation to the MFL is likely to be much smaller, they may still be at a disadvantage because the MFL teacher may use English or Welsh to explain and clarify aspects of the MFL. However, more proficient additional language learners may be at an advantage because already being bilingual assists the learning of new languages.

6 Essentially, they are becoming trilingual or multilingual, not just bilingual, in order to meet the demands of their daily life at home and at school.
opportunities exist for first languages to be developed and there is considerable pressure for them not to do so.

3.3 Additive and subtractive bilingualism

Some teachers and parents hold the view that using home languages is bad for pupils when trying to learn English or Welsh. Several minority ethnic pupils have reported being regularly told by teachers not to speak their home language. The EALAW research study found that only half of mainstream teachers who taught minority ethnic pupils believed it was beneficial to use home languages in the classroom and almost half ‘rarely’ or ‘never’ encouraged their use (WAG, 2003a: 59).

The practical consequence of this is that many additional language learners experience subtractive rather than additive bilingualism (tri- or multi-lingualism), unlike most English and Welsh second language learners who develop additively. This means that the child’s first language does not continue to develop at an age-appropriate rate and consequently the child has fewer linguistic resources to draw on to assist cognitive and additional language development. This has an impact on their academic achievement in school.

The success of bilingual education approaches in Wales, Canada and the US is largely attributed to the additive nature of the process (Cummins, 1996; Baker, 2001; Thomas and Collier, 2002) because both languages are developed to high levels of academic proficiency in oracy and literacy. Cummins (1996) asserts that in order to develop cognitively and transfer concepts, ideas and knowledge from their first language to an additional language, pupils must continue to develop their first language. If not, then subtractive bilingualism takes place, which can result in pupils reaching the end of their schooling without being proficient in either their first or their additional language.

This is a crucial factor that distinguishes minority ethnic additional language learners from majority ethnic English and Welsh second language learners. Pupils in the latter situation may receive support in their own language as one of the official languages of Wales through education, the media and from people around them who can extend and develop their languages additively to higher levels of proficiency in both
oracy and literacy.\textsuperscript{7} Many early stage additional language learners do not receive any support in their home language and the level of English or Welsh that can be used to assist in the learning process is not comparable to their academic potential.

The conclusion to draw from this is that, wherever possible, additional language learners should be encouraged to develop their home languages and use them in the learning process. Where support from others in their home languages is not available, pupils need appropriately tailored support across the curriculum to give them full access to learning opportunities and to develop the languages of education.

4. Supporting additional language learners

4.1 Educational entitlements

As the highest concentrations of additional language learners are in the large towns and cities of Wales, there has been a general perception that addressing the educational needs of an ethnically diverse school population is only a significant issue for schools in the urban centres. However, smaller numbers of pupils from diverse backgrounds have been present all over Wales for many years and increasing numbers continue to settle in locations across the country. Their social, educational and linguistic needs are no less significant for them than for those in the large towns and cities. Equally, the responsibility for adequately meeting their educational needs is no less significant for the schools and teachers in more rural areas who educate them.

As citizens of Wales, pupils of all backgrounds are fully entitled to the educational opportunities offered in Wales:

Schools in Wales should ensure that all learners are engaged as full members of their school communities, accessing the wider

\textsuperscript{7} Very little research has been done on the language development and subsequent academic success of minority ethnic additional language learners who have gone through bilingual Welsh-English or Welsh-medium education in Wales. It is urgently needed. Consequently, most of this article refers to EAL development and the achievement of minority ethnic pupils in English-medium schools.
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Each child’s right to equality of access, provision and outcome in education is supported by legislation in the 1988 Education Reform Act, in the specific duties placed on schools by the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, in certain provisions of the 1976 Race Relations Act and in the 2006 Equality Act. Working towards these goals is essential to create a fairer, more equal and socially cohesive Wales.

4.2 Mainstream responsibilities

The responsibility for educating additional language learners of minority ethnic backgrounds lies with mainstream schools. All teachers should be equipped through training to meet the needs of a diverse pupil cohort and to support pupils’ language development.

Until recently in Wales, guidance and standards on minority ethnic attainment and additional language development have not been strong but the revised Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) standards (NAfW, 2006b) and the revised 2008 National Curriculum documents have been strengthened to include more overt references. For example, in order to gain QTS, trainee teachers must achieve a number of standards relating to diversity including the following:

...take account of and support pupils’ varying needs so that girls and boys, from all ethnic groups, can make good progress (NAfW, 2006b: Standard S3.1.2).

...begin to analyse the language demands and learning activities in order to provide cognitive challenge as well as language support (NAfW, 2006b: Standard S3.2.5).

...support those pupils learning English or Welsh where this is the language in which they are being taught and is different from the language or form of language of their home, with the help of an experienced teacher where appropriate (NAfW, 2006b: Standard S3.3.5).

In the introduction to each of the revised 2008 National Curriculum Orders, the ‘Including all learners’ statement contains the following sentences:
Schools should develop approaches that support the ethnic and cultural identities of all learners and reflect a range of perspectives, to engage learners and prepare them for life as global citizens (WAG, 2008b: 4).

For learners whose first language is neither English nor Welsh, schools should take specific action to help them learn both English and Welsh through the curriculum. Schools should provide learners with material that is appropriate to their ability, previous education and experience, and which extends their language development. Schools should also encourage the use of learners’ home languages for learning (WAG, 2008b: 4).

The successful implementation of these obligations will depend largely on the level and quality of training provided by ITET institutions, LEAs and schools for trainee teachers, Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) and for experienced teachers engaged in Continuing Professional Development (CPD).

4.3 Additional language support and funding
In addition to the provision and support offered by mainstream class and subject specialist teachers in England and Wales, funding has been made available since 1966 through various mechanisms to provide additional specialist support for minority ethnic pupils learning EAL, or ESL (English as a Second Language) as it used to be described.

Originally, funding from Home Office Section 11 was made available to local authorities with substantial numbers of New Commonwealth origin pupils to help them overcome ‘linguistic and cultural barriers’ that might hinder them from assimilating into British society (Bourne, 1989). Initially, much of this funding was used to pay for staff working in Language Units where learners were taught separately from the mainstream education provision offered in schools, often for quite long periods of time (CRE, 1986).

Following the Swann (DES, 1985) and Calderdale (CRE, 1986) reports, segregated classes were considered discriminatory on the grounds that they did not provide minority ethnic children with access to the full curricular and educational experience they were entitled to. Segregated teaching was no longer officially condoned within the field of
ESL/EAL. Together with the Education Reform Act (1988), these reports led to the full integration of minority ethnic pupils in mainstream schools and the majority of additional language support, specifically that funded through Section 11, was now transferred to the mainstream classroom context. However, Cable, Leung and Vasquez (2004) observed that, even though segregated ESL reception classes ‘disappeared’ from public educational discourse, in reality:

Off-site provision and language centres continued to operate in some areas up until at least 1992 and many secondary schools continued to utilise withdrawal classes and induction programmes to support new arrivals (Cable et al, 2004: 6).

Prior to the 1990s, the majority of Section 11 funding went to the major urban centres in England only. Most authorities in Wales were not deemed to have ‘substantial’ numbers of pupils and did not receive Section 11 funding but a few LEAs paid for individual teachers or small teams of specialist staff out of their central education budgets to support pupils’ additional language development and to offer advice to schools.

In the early 1990s, a small number of Welsh authorities with the largest numbers of minority ethnic EAL pupils submitted successful bids under a new Section 11 bidding system that enabled them to employ larger teams of staff for several years. However, across Wales, many schools and pupils still received no specialist support so mainstream teachers alone had responsibility for supporting their additional language learners even though few had any relevant training.

The first official report on provision for EAL in Wales, produced by Estyn (2000), identified inconsistencies in provision for EAL pupils across Wales and, in schools that had no specialist support, such pupils were ‘unable to receive their full curriculum entitlement’ (Estyn 2000: 2). Few schools had specific procedures for dealing with racism and promoting racial equality, and mainstream teachers often had little understanding of how to meet the needs of EAL pupils. There were indications that EAL support as a profession was marginalised in Wales and that, although most support took place in mainstream classes, withdrawal to a separate teaching
room was also used as a teaching strategy. While the report identified that the specialist support offered was generally effective, it was clear that there was little consistency in approaches to identifying and helping EAL pupils to meet language demands.

During the late 1990s, Section 11 of the Home Office was closed down and the funds were moved to the School Standards section of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in England and to the Welsh Office in Wales (Estyn, 2000). The fund was renamed the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) to reflect the targeting of support aimed at raising minority ethnic pupils’ achievement, not just developing English as an additional language or overcoming linguistic and cultural barriers (Jones and Wallace, 2001). This move was supported by evidence from studies (see Gillborn and Gipps, 1996) that revealed disparities in the achievements of minority ethnic pupils and identified a range of contributory factors impacting on attainment in addition to language proficiency.

Since devolution in 1999, the responsibility for administering EMAG in Wales has lain with the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG). However, it can be argued that a lack of experience in addressing minority ethnic achievement and EAL issues at strategic levels in government, together with dominant restoration agendas for the Welsh language and identity (Phillips and Sanders, 2000; WAG, 2003b), has meant that EAL provision and support for languages other than English and Welsh have been accorded a fairly low priority status. Official guidance for EAL in Wales has remained minimal while, in England, the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) and the DfES (now DCSF) have produced quite extensive guidance on differentiating mainstream initiatives to meet the needs of EAL pupils.

In recent years, several factors have contributed to an increase in demand for additional language support:8 growing awareness of the need to support minority ethnic pupils’

---

8 Demand is now also increasing in Welsh-medium and bilingual schools raising important, but as yet unanswered, questions about equivalent support for English and Welsh Additional Language (EWAL) provision.
language and learning needs; more accurate reporting of numbers through ethnic monitoring; an increase in numbers through dispersion of asylum seekers; and European migration and the employment of people from abroad. These have all led to a marked increase in the total figures of pupils now deemed eligible for support. Recognition of this has brought about a progressive increase in funding from WAG.

In 2007, a separate grant for asylum seekers was merged with EMAG to form a new Minority Ethnic Achievement Grant (MEAG). MEAG currently operates as a match-funded stand-alone grant of approximately £9m divided between all 22 LEAs in Wales using a weighted formula based on figures submitted annually. Asylum seekers and early stage learners (assessed on an All-Wales 5 Stage scale) receive higher weightings to ensure that funds are directed to the areas of greatest need. Several LEAs receive sufficient funds to employ teams of specialist teachers and bilingual teaching assistants. Others either buy in specialist support from other authorities or use the money to pay for staff time in schools. In addition to MEAG, the Gypsy Traveller Grant provides separate funding to support provision for children of Gypsy and Traveller backgrounds. Some LEAs also manage to access other external funding sources to support projects targeted at raising achievement.

4.4 Models of support provision

In endeavouring to meet the needs of minority ethnic additional language learners and in utilising MEAG funding, one of the biggest areas of debate is over which model of support provision to adopt. During the past four decades, various models have been adopted in the provision of support for ESL/EAL (see Davison in Mohan, Leung and Davison, 2001: 59 and Leung, 2003: 4-6 for detailed overviews). Broadly speaking, the models are characterised by three interlinked elements: the location of provision, the orientation or balance between subject content and language, and the type of methodology.

The main debate about location has centred around whether or not to withdraw children from mainstream classrooms to teach them separately. Withdrawal allows
language support teachers to focus more specifically on the individual or small group of children and gives them greater control over the subject matter and language used.

However, since the Calderdale (CRE, 1986) report deemed segregated teaching to be discriminatory, mainstream integration with in-class language support has been promoted by many as the model of best practice (Bourne, 1989; Bourne and McPake, 1991; Clegg, 1996). Often, in-class support takes the form of ‘at the elbow’ assistance, with teachers or bilingual assistants rephrasing and explaining things that pupils don’t understand or helping them construct appropriate language to meet the demands of a lesson. At times though, particularly with beginners, this has become a kind of withdrawal in the classroom where a child or group of children are involved in a social interaction with the support teacher that is largely separate from the learning activities of the rest of the class.

The debate about the orientation of subject content and language in teaching has been strongly influenced by theories of language and learning and by the choice of teaching location. A traditional view of language as an abstract rule-based system suggests that language can be taught intensively as a subject by focusing on groups of words, graded grammatical structures and sentence patterns that exemplify the rules of syntax. This approach has been used for many years in foreign language teaching but it can only be done effectively where the choice of language focus takes priority over subject matter. In withdrawal, greater control over the language focus can be exerted by the teacher but, at times, this can result in a weaker focus on subject learning.

The theory that learners can acquire an additional language by being immersed in the target language has added support to the practice of mainstream integration. However, in mainstream classrooms, where lessons are driven by national curriculum subject learning goals, the language focus is much more difficult to control or adapt to the level of the learners. The language demands of mainstream class lessons arise out of the learning activities based on the subject matter rather than from a pre-chosen set of language items. They are often unpredictable. The language used by class teachers
and expected of pupils is often pitched at the majority of the class with assumptions about their linguistic capabilities based on native-speaker norms (Harklau, 1994). This can result in a tension between the teaching of subject ‘content’ and the teaching of ‘language’. Teachers have also observed that many older additional language learners become ‘submersed’ rather than ‘immersed’ in a language that they don’t understand, which can result in demotivation and lack of learning. As a result, most of the work on EAL pedagogy over the last two decades has aimed to find ways of integrating subject content and language learning without compromising either.

The debate about methodology is closely linked to both location and language-content orientation. Since the evolution of Communicative Language Teaching many additional language teachers have concentrated on trying to create language-rich environments where communication is a significant part of the lesson, whether in withdrawal or in class.

For mainstream integration, child-centred methodologies and Krashen and Terrell’s (1983) Natural Approach have shaped approaches by promoting collaborative, interactional learning where ‘natural’ communication between first and additional language learners can take place. Clegg (1996) even suggests that the mainstream classroom is the ideal location for additional language development if the methodology can be made appropriate. In trying to achieve this, specialist language teachers have often had to challenge traditional transmisional approaches used by class teachers, particularly in secondary schools, but this entails their involvement in both planning and delivery. For this reason, partnership teaching has been advocated as the best practice model for teachers (Bourne and McPake, 1991).

However, partnership teaching has often been frustrated by limited time for liaison and joint planning between mainstream and specialist teachers, particularly in secondary schools. It has also been hindered by the need for widespread peripatetic support and by a general marginalisation of ‘additional language support’. According to Creese (2004:
200), ‘fully fledged cooperative relationships’ are rare. In-class support work is not often seen as ‘real teaching’ (Creese, 2004: 193) and is subordinated beneath subject teaching agendas:

In the worse (sic) case scenario the curriculum support role played by the EAL teachers becomes part of the picture of deficit, not because what the EAL teacher is doing is intrinsically unhelpful but because there are other educational discourses and agendas more dominant in classroom life (Creese, 2004: 191).

In some cases, the subordination of additional language support beneath subject teaching agendas has redirected support teachers’ attention towards helping pupils gain access to curriculum content (Leung, 2001) through simplifying or circumventing linguistic challenges, using undemanding language and non-linguistic means of communication rather than extending and refining pupils’ English language resources in an explicit way.

4.5 Models of support in Wales

In Wales, many pupils are dispersed widely in small numbers, so peripatetic support, where specialist EAL teachers visit several schools in a week, has become common practice. In many of these schools, temporary withdrawal from the mainstream class for intensive language-focused teaching has been quite widespread. Despite prevailing recommendations that best practice should promote full mainstream integration and collaborative partnership teaching, some secondary schools in south Wales have operated classes for new and recent arrivals where they can be taught on-site but separately from mainstream classes until they are deemed sufficiently proficient in English to be transferred to a full mainstream timetable.

Where numbers allow, specialist staff based in schools can engage in more in-class support. Often, this support is provided at the elbow of individuals in mainstream classes but attempts to develop partnership teaching relationships have been successful in a number of schools.
In parts of Wales, both withdrawal for intensive Welsh language tuition and immersion in mainstream Welsh-medium classes are used for pupils whose first language is not Welsh. Following similar models in Canada, the Welsh Language Board supports separate Language Units for Welsh Second Language learners where they are taught an intensive Welsh language course before being immersed in Welsh-medium or bilingual Welsh-English schools. This provision may be accessed by minority and majority ethnic learners but is questioned by some within the EAL field who have resisted segregated teaching for many years.

5. Conclusion

Although Cardiff still has by far the largest numbers of pupils and the largest specialist Ethnic Minority Achievement Service, all authorities in Wales now have sufficient numbers of pupils to employ dedicated specialist staff to meet the educational needs of minority ethnic additional language learners. Increasing numbers of learners are also attending Welsh-medium and bilingual Welsh-English schools. These pupils will have additional language support needs for both English and Welsh in order to participate in learning across the curriculum. Their needs extend beyond language to include social, academic, cultural and religious considerations.

The attainment gaps evident between different ethnic groupings indicate that some pupils will be seriously disadvantaged in their educational and wider social life if they are not given appropriately tailored support to reach high levels of language proficiency and gain good grades in examinations.

The increase in numbers and wide distribution of eligible pupils is currently leading to a shift in thinking about optimal approaches to delivery of support. As there are insufficient specialist teachers to support all pupils for a productive amount of time, greater emphasis is being placed on training mainstream class teachers in the strategies required to differentiate their teaching to meet the educational needs of minority ethnic pupils and promote additional language development. To achieve these ends, nationally consistent approaches are required for both teacher training and
classroom pedagogy, with a clear emphasis on collaborative partnerships between specialist achievement and language support teachers and mainstream class and subject teachers. Variations in levels of expertise and specialist staffing in different Local Authorities suggest that cooperation and a sharing of expertise between LEAs would be of benefit to teachers and pupils across Wales as a whole.
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2. The 2008 national curriculum for Wales and additional language development

Jonathan Brentnall

Abstract
This article discusses the main characteristics of the 2008 skills-focused curriculum having direct relevance to additional language development. It begins by discussing the presentation of language as a set of communication skills in both the curriculum Orders and the Skills Framework, and goes on to examine the underlying theory of language influencing this portrayal. The article points out the importance of subject content meanings in choices of language form and offers a more socio-cultural perspective of language and learning that may help to resolve some of the dilemmas arising from theoretical and pedagogical inconsistencies. In order for the positive potential of the skills-focused curriculum to be realised, interactive, collaborative learning methodologies need to be combined with scaffolding and modelling of language form derived from the demands of each lesson and tailored to the needs of individual learners.

1. The national curriculum 2008: a focus on skills
The 2008 national curriculum for Wales has been revised from previous versions to reflect a more skills-based focus. Thinking, Communication, ICT and Number are defined as distinct sets of skills in the Skills Framework (WAG, 2008a) and at the start of each subject Order. All of the subject Orders follow a consistent format with the Programmes of Study divided into two sections: Skills and Range. The phrase ‘knowledge, understanding and skills’, from earlier versions, has been rewritten as ‘skills, knowledge and understanding’ and in all subjects the Skills section precedes the Range. In this way, teachers are expected to use Skills as the organising
factor in planning, developing the Skills through the Range of subject content.

Many of the statements that define subject Skills are similar or identical to those in the 2000 Orders. For example, in History at KS3:

**Pupils should be given opportunities to:**

1. select, recall and organise historical information with increasing independence and accuracy (ACCAC, 2000a: 11; WAG, 2008b: 15).

Others have been reduced or made more specific. The subject content requirements described in the Range have also been reduced and made less prescriptive in most subject areas.

The foregrounding of skills is intended to draw more attention to the importance of adapting teaching to the various skill levels of children in a class. The reduction of prescriptive detail of subject content is intended to give teachers greater flexibility in the choice of subject matter through which they can teach the skills.

2. The language model

2.1 Language as communication

In the 2008 curriculum, language is presented primarily as a set of communication skills and Communication is given a high priority across the curriculum. As in earlier versions, Communication is still framed within the broad strands of Oracy, Reading and Writing, with Wider Communication covering non-verbal forms of expression. In the Skills Framework, Oracy is described as developing and presenting information and ideas; Reading is about locating, selecting and using information from sources; Writing is about organising ideas and information accurately (WAG, 2008a: 17). Each strand is elaborated with more detailed statements defining generic cross-curricular skills, for example:

Communicate with increasing confidence to peers and others. Begin to modify their talk to the requirements of the audience, using a growing vocabulary (WAG, 2008a: 18. Oracy: Presenting information and ideas).
Discuss and evaluate texts, using inference and deduction where necessary and considering carefully the interpretations of others (WAG, 2008a: 19a. Reading: Responding to what has been read).

Write short, creative and factual passages. Check work and sometimes correct errors (WAG, 2008a: 19a. Writing: Organising ideas and information).

These and the other statements about Communication in the Skills Framework include linguistic skills, communicative language functions and some references to formal aspects of language use such as punctuation and sentence structure but there are no explicit references to ‘grammar’ or ‘standard’ language. The formal aspects of language are treated as choices to be made from a repertoire of vocabulary, punctuation and sentence structures, adapted to ‘suit’ subject, audience and purpose or to ‘enhance’ meaning.

References to grammar and standard language use are found in the English and Welsh Orders. The Welsh Order has retained a focus on word classes and elements of grammatical structure but the more extensive detail on grammatical form and word classes that used to be in the Language Development sections of the English Order has been removed, leaving only a handful of statements such as the following:

**Pupils should be given opportunities to communicate in writing and to:**


The emphasis on attention to form is intended to improve accuracy in order to facilitate communication.

In the Skills Framework, the statements for communication have deliberately been denuded of any subject content in order to make them generic:

The skills of communication have been separated as far as possible from the subject content of the language subject Orders (WAG, 2008a: 17. Skills Framework).
However, in the 'Developing communication' section of each subject Order the common statement about developing oracy, reading, writing and wider communication is complemented by a brief interpretation of how communication may apply specifically to the subject, for example:

In **history**, learners develop their skills of oracy, reading and writing and wider communication skills through using aural and written sources and communicating ideas, opinions, arguments and conclusions (WAG, 2008b: 6. History).

In **mathematics**, learners listen and respond to others. They discuss their work with others using appropriate mathematical language. They read and extract information from mathematical texts. When solving problems, they present their findings and reasoning orally and in writing, using symbols, diagrams, tables and graphs as appropriate (WAG, 2008d: 6. Mathematics).

These statements reveal a more explicit recognition of the subject-specific nature of the purposes of language than was reflected in the 2000 Orders. They draw attention to at least some of the functions that language fulfils in each subject and they direct teachers to go beyond the simple integration of speaking, listening, reading and writing activities.

However, they do not constitute a requirement to 'teach' or model language form\(^9\) explicitly. They are just general indications that different subject contexts give rise to different purposes for which pupils have to communicate. There is no apparent link made to the way in which the actual forms of language realise particular subject content meanings in specific ways.

This is an important consideration for planning additional language development work where pupils need to learn subject-related skills, subject content and language all at the same time. The portrayal of communication as a skill,

---

\(^9\) By language form, I mean the formal realisations of language in spoken utterances and written texts. The actual sequences of words, grammatical structures and their combinations, which form chunks of language, are the end result of choices made by the language user drawing on internal and external language resources and contextual information.
demonstrated through appropriate choices of vocabulary, punctuation and sentence structures, does not take account of the fact that additional language learners may not have the appropriate linguistic resources to draw on. They need to extend their range of resources as they are learning. This also has a bearing on the way in which teachers approach the relationship between language and thinking in the learning process.

2.2 The relationship between language and thinking in the learning process

One of the more significant changes in the 2008 curriculum is the clear focus on Thinking Skills. In the 2000 curriculum Orders, the inter-relationship between language and thought was not strongly foregrounded although the role of language as a tool for developing thinking was recognised in a small number of statements such as the following:

They should be taught to structure their talk, using it to develop and clarify their thinking (ACCAC, 2000b: 7. English KS1 Focus Statement).

**Pupils should be given opportunities to:**

1. talk for a range of purposes, including: ...
   - using talk to develop their thinking by exploring, developing and clarifying ideas; predicting outcomes and discussing possibilities (ACCAC, 2000b: 8. KS1 English Oracy: Range).

**Pupils should be given opportunities to:**

1. write for varied purposes, understanding that writing is essential to thinking and learning, and enjoyable in itself (ACCAC, 2000b: 20. KS2 English Writing: Range).

Developing thinking was presented as one of the *purposes* of communication and language use.

In the 2008 subject Orders and in the Skills Framework, Thinking Skills and Communication Skills are defined as two distinct sets of skills. Developing thinking is defined as:

developing patterns of ideas that help learners acquire deeper understanding and enable them to explore and make sense of their world (WAG, 2008a: 10).
The role of language in thinking is presented as a matter of pedagogy:

Both developing thinking and assessment for learning rely on basic principles of pedagogy such as questioning technique and articulating strategies (WAG, 2008a: 10).

The underlying conception is that thinking is an internal process, communication is an external process. Language use, particularly speaking and listening, can assist the development of thinking but the positioning of language as external communication implies that it is not being treated as part of the internal process of thinking in the way Vygotsky (1986) suggests in his theory of inner speech.

In Vygotsky’s theory, at birth, Thought and Language are separate. Whereas Thought is an inherent capacity bound up with primary consciousness of the world, Language must be learned. As a very young child makes associations between their primary consciousness and the sounds and sequences of ‘words’ they hear spoken, they imitate and experiment until the language they are using begins to conform to the language they are hearing. In this process, associations are made between the child’s perceived meanings and the sounds of language. As the associations become established, the child’s externalised language ‘moves inwards’ and becomes internalised as ‘inner speech’. Inner speech then becomes a tool of thought in what Vygotsky describes as a ‘dynamic, shifting, unstable thing, fluttering between word and thought, the two more or less stable, more or less firmly delineated components of verbal thought’ (Vygotsky, 1986: 249). At this point, the relationship between thought and language becomes inter-dependent. Language facilitates the formation of new and abstract concepts. It enables abstract thought and allows the user to create new and original meanings – it is a ‘semogenic’ or meaning-creating resource (Halliday, 1994). It becomes integral to the construction of knowledge and understanding (Mercer, 1995).

Instead of describing language and thought as intertwined in this way, the Skills Framework presents metacognition as the most important component in developing thinking:
Metacognition (thinking about thinking) is the central and crucial process in developing thinking (WAG, 2008a: 12).

Creative, critical, imaginative and abstract thinking are all highlighted as means of extending pupils’ thinking skills. Language is only explicitly presented as part of the external process of communication in social interaction.

Despite this, the terminology used to describe Thinking Skills reveals precisely how significant language is, for example:

In mathematics, learners ask questions, explore alternative ideas and make links with previous learning in order to develop strategies to solve problems. They gather, select, organise and use information, and identify patterns and relationships. They predict outcomes, make and test hypotheses, reason mathematically when investigating, and analyse and interpret mathematical information. They describe what they have learned, reflect on their work by evaluating their results in line with the original problem, and justify their conclusions and generalisations (WAG, 2008d: 6. Mathematics).

There are ten words in this paragraph on Thinking Skills that refer directly to functions of language: ask, identify, predict, [make] hypotheses, analyse, describe, evaluating, justify, conclusions and generalisations. These functions are those that Swain (in Lantolf, 2000: 103) says ‘can be considered simultaneously as cognitive activity and its product’. In addition, gathering, selecting, organising and using information and testing hypotheses may also be mediated by language.

In the extract above, these learning behaviours are all presented as subject-related Thinking Skills rather than linguistic skills. There is an implicit assumption that pupils will have the linguistic resources to be able to ‘explore alternative ideas’, ‘predict outcomes’ or ‘make and test hypotheses’. Consequently, language development, as an object of teaching and learning, is not presented as something that needs explicit attention during the development of thinking in subject learning.
Also, there is a danger that, in trying to challenge pupils cognitively, teachers may use similarly challenging language. Cognitively complex questioning techniques and articulation strategies may be too linguistically demanding for additional language learners to comprehend unless teachers differentiate their language use. This is very significant for pupils who need to develop cognitively, academically and learn the language/s of education at the same time. If they are excluded linguistically by language beyond their comprehension, they will be less able to access and respond to the cognitive and academic challenges.

2.3 The underlying theory of language in the 2008 curriculum

Overall, the conception of language presented in the 2008 curriculum is of a set of communicative and formal skills used to express knowledge and understanding. Communication is a cross-curricular skill but the teaching of language form and structure is the preserve of the Language subjects. The underlying theory of language appears little different from that in the 1995 and 2000 versions, which were strongly influenced by traditional and cognitivist theories of linguistics.

The theoretical model of language as communication is most clearly illustrated by the 'conduit metaphor' in which language is regarded as a kind of abstract formal 'code'. Communication takes place when a 'message producer' learns the code and assembles linguistic 'output' by combining pieces of the code in the correct order to make a message. Language is the 'medium' or 'conduit' of the message communicated in speech or writing, received as 'input' through listening or reading, and then decoded by a 'message receiver' who 'processes' the code to comprehend the meaning (Lightbown and Spada, 1999). Language users can improve the accuracy of their communication by adhering to the rules of 'correct' combination, standard grammar and syntax.

In the conduit metaphor, there is a conceptual divide between the internal meanings or 'content' (the thoughts) that the message producer wishes to communicate, and language (the words) as the external medium of communicating meanings. This divide allows language to be treated as a set
of generic communicative skills that can be denuded of meaningful content and then applied in different subject contexts to fulfil particular functions or purposes.

Although the 2008 Skills Framework acknowledges that not all the listed generic skills will be relevant to all subjects and that the skills-focus of lessons will ultimately be determined by the Programmes of Study in each subject Order, this is not quite the same as saying that language choices realise the meanings of subject content. The relationship between subject content meaning and its realisation in language form is not made clear. Attention to clause construction, the choice of words and the ways they go together to realise meaning is not presented as something that needs to be modelled explicitly for pupils in context.

3. A socio-cultural perspective of language development

3.1 The relationship between context, meaning, function and language form

In contrast to the more traditional view of language as an abstract code, more socio-cultural theories (e.g. Wertsch, 1991; Halliday, 1994; Lantolf and Pavlenko, 1995) suggest that the form of language is not determined by a set of context-independent formal rules of grammar and syntax but is shaped by its cultural and situational context and by the meanings it realises. In this conception, meaning is not merely communicated as a coded message through language, as in the conduit metaphor, but it is constructed and realised in language. Meaning shapes the form of language. In Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday, 1994; Bloor and Bloor, 1995) the interdependent relationship between thought and language, described by Vygotsky, means that the words we choose and the ways we put them together actually reflect the meanings we want to convey. The relationships between the words in a clause, between clauses and between different chunks of text reflect semantic relationships, not just rules of grammar, syntax and text construction.

In different cultural and social contexts, groups of language users develop ways of using language driven by the
meanings they need to communicate. Certain choices and patterns of words become conventionalised through social interaction and these language features characterise the discourses of each context. In the curriculum, each subject area has its own discourses, its own ways of using language, its own ways of combining words. Although some features may be shared with other subject areas, some may not. The differences extend beyond key vocabulary to the ways words are combined, to the semantic relations expressed in grammar, to variations in clause construction, to the use of discourse connectives and the style and structure of extended texts. There is an interrelationship between meaning, context, communicative function and the structural system of language, which simultaneously act together to determine the choice of form.

3.2 The implications of a socio-cultural perspective for curriculum language development

Considering language development from a socio-cultural perspective, teaching language as a separate subject or as a set of generic communication skills may not result in the development of a full range of language resources or proficient language use in a range of different contexts. The forms and patterns of language learned in one context may not be automatically transferable to another. Developing a communication skill in one subject area will not guarantee successful application in another.

For example, the forms of language needed to develop the ‘generic’ communicative skill of ‘evaluating a text’ will differ in English, in History, in Geography or in Mathematics depending on the content of the text being discussed and the purpose of the evaluation. Differences are even apparent in the statements from each subject order which refer to evaluation:


evaluate results by relating them to the initial question or problem (WAG, 2008d: 17. Mathematics).
read a variety of texts in order to evaluate persuasive techniques (WAG, 2008c: 31. English).

analyse and evaluate ideas and evidence, answer questions and justify conclusions, e.g. analyse trends over time, evaluate causes and effects (WAG, 2008e: 15. Geography).

Evaluating persuasive techniques in a text in English will not utilise the same language as evaluating an interpretation of history in a History text because different content is being evaluated and because different questions need to be answered by an evaluation in each subject area.

In both English and History, pupils may be expected to explore the writer’s motives and intentions and may address questions such as: 'What type of text is it?'; 'Does the writer use facts or opinions?'; 'Is there bias in the text?'; but for each task the vocabulary will vary according to the subject matter of the text and when it was written. The grammar is more likely to feature past tense constructions for the historical writing than for a more contemporary text in English, for example.

To evaluate an interpretation of history, pupils are likely to compare the text with other historical information and interpretations and make judgments about its historical accuracy. They may be expected to ask: 'When was the text written?'; 'In what social and historical context was it written?'; 'What does the text tell you about the people, places and events of the time?'; questions that are less relevant for the English subject area.

To evaluate a persuasive text in English, pupils are more likely to be asked to identify how specific techniques such as repetition, exaggeration, rhetorical questions or emotive language are used and how effective the techniques are in achieving their persuasive goal. They may be expected to analyse features such as the level of formality and conciseness of the language.

Although both tasks aim to develop pupils’ evaluation skills, the context and language demands differ. Each kind of evaluation arises from a subject-specific need linked directly to an academic goal and involves different subject content meanings.
Although there may be some shared linguistic features between communicative functions or skills like evaluation in different contexts, the key to promoting additional language development in learning activities lies in the language forms chosen to realise them. Certain communicative functions may be characterised in general terms by linguistic features or patterns, such as the use of adverbs with verbs for describing processes or the way things happen; the use of future tenses for predictions; the use of conditionals for making hypotheses; or the various constructions used for asking questions. These structural features realise some of the semantic relations but they combine in different ways with the various vocabulary choices and word orders arising out of the content focus of the activity. Even within a subject, the language used to evaluate one set of results, for example, ‘by relating them to the initial question or problem’ (WAG, 2000d: 17. Mathematics), will differ depending on the nature of the results and the initial question. The meanings in the subject content shape the choices of vocabulary, grammar and syntax. Pupils will only be assisted in developing their linguistic evaluation in each subject if the language demands arising from the subject context, content meaning and function of each activity are considered together to identify the appropriate choices of form.

Therefore, the success of a skills-focused approach in promoting language development depends upon the extent to which the teacher combines the notional language skill with subject content in considering which models of language form to focus on in learning activities. A pupil cannot be taught merely to ‘evaluate’, or ‘explain’ or ‘draw conclusions’. They have to ‘evaluate something’, ‘explain something’ or ‘draw conclusions about something’, something which has meaning and which has semantic relationships with other things. The knowledge and meanings of subject content are not conceptually separate from language as the ‘message-carrier’ in the learning process, they are bound up with its formal realisation. Consequently, language skills cannot be developed independently of content, they must be developed through subject content.
This perspective suggests that, despite the change from a content-focused to a skills-focused curriculum, subject content will still be one of the main drivers of language choice in lessons that are intended to focus on skills. This is a significant consideration for teachers planning to support pupils’ additional language development.

4. Additional language learners’ language development in the 2008 curriculum

4.1 Learners’ entitlements

In the 2008 curriculum, the following statement in the ‘Including all learners: responsibilities of schools’ section of each subject Order makes it clear that additional language learners should receive appropriately tailored education provision and support to develop their language and learning across the curriculum:

For learners whose first language is neither English nor Welsh, schools should take specific action to help them learn both English and Welsh through the curriculum. Schools should provide learners with material that is appropriate to their ability, previous education and experience, and which extends their language development. Schools should also encourage the use of learners’ home languages for learning (WAG, 2008f: 4. Design and technology).

The last sentence recognises the value of languages other than English and Welsh in the learning process and this is echoed in the Skills Framework:

The communication section aims to support bilingual and multilingual development. Language skills learned in one language should support the development of knowledge and skills in another (WAG, 2008a: 17. Skills Framework).

The skills outlined particularly in Developing thinking and Developing communication can be successfully developed in English and Welsh and, indeed, in other languages. Learners should be given opportunities to practise and develop these skills in more than one language (WAG, 2008a: 6. Skills Framework).
These statements clearly affirm children’s rights to use their first language/s to support their own learning and they encourage teachers, teaching assistants and peers to use pupils’ first languages to assist the learning process. Pupils are encouraged to think and communicate in all the languages they are familiar with in order to support learning and to develop them in their own right. This plainly opposes the view that children and young people should not use languages other than English and Welsh in school and is a positive endorsement of the benefits of bi- and multi-lingualism.

In fact, the foregrounding of skills in the 2008 curriculum is intended to draw more attention to the importance of adapting teaching to the diverse skills and skill levels of children in a class. It offers potential for the language development needs of additional language learners to be addressed more explicitly in mainstream classes.

4.2 Methodological considerations for integrated language and learning development

In mainstream classes, additional language learners need to develop their curriculum-related skills, knowledge and understanding and develop their language proficiency. They need to learn new language and new curriculum content and skills at the same time.

Since the late 1980s/early 1990s, many in the field of additional language development (e.g. Davison, 1990; Bourne and McPake, 1991; Gibbons, 1991; Clegg, 1996; Ovando and Collier, 1998) have expressed the view that the mainstream classroom can be a suitable environment for this to take place if the appropriate methodology is used by teachers.

In the content-driven curriculum of 1989-2007, integrating language and content learning presented a considerable challenge for specialist language support teachers because language development was subordinated beneath subject content concerns in lesson planning. The higher profile of language as a set of Communication skills in the 2008 curriculum may help to address this but, in order for linguistic, cognitive and academic development to be effectively integrated, class teachers need to see themselves as language teachers too. Particularly in secondary schools, where most
mainstream teachers are subject specialists, many teachers have regarded themselves as teachers of subject knowledge and skills rather than as teachers of language (PPI, 1998; Huang and Morgan, 2003; Arkoudis, 2003; Creese, 2004). The PPI report noted that, when asked to develop language across the curriculum policies, subject teachers felt they were being asked to do the ‘English teachers’ job for them’ (PPI, 1998: 16) reflecting a perceptual divide between language development and subject teaching. There is a danger that subject teachers may simply reconfigure their self-perception as teachers of subject skills rather than as subject and language teachers.

From a pedagogical point of view, the emphasis on language use in the 2008 curriculum offers the potential to create more opportunities for learners to engage in meaningful interaction with their peers and possibly their teachers. In the Skills Framework, Communication and Thinking are brought together in pedagogy where ‘working with others’, ‘listening to the contributions of others’, and working in ‘pairs and groups’ are promoted as ‘crucial’ to the learning process (WAG, 2008a: 8).

This role accorded to interaction and collaboration in learning indicates a shift towards a more social constructivist perspective on the learning process. Learning through interaction is actually described as ‘social construction’ (WAG, 2008a: 8). This promotion of collaborative approaches offers hope that, even though the underlying theory of the nature of language in the 2008 curriculum may be inconsistent with socio-cultural linguistic theory, the teaching methods adopted may enable additional language learners to engage in productive learning activities. This will depend on the extent to which a coherent social constructivist perspective on learning and language development is adopted in pedagogy by promoting scaffolded interactions with explicit language modelling.

The text of the Skills Framework seems to assume that ‘opportunities to use’ language will naturally result in language development. By ‘immersing’ children in language, it is presumed they will develop in a way that is strongly
reminiscent of Krashen and Terrell’s (1983) Natural Approach and early Canadian immersion programmes:

Children are immersed in language experiences and activities. Their skills develop through talking, signing/communicating and listening (WAG, 2008c: 10. English: Progression in English).

The assumption that immersion will naturally facilitate language development is debatable. For some years, the capacity of simple immersion education to ensure the development of high level academic proficiency in second/additional languages has been called into question (Harley and Swain, 1984; Davison, 1990; Cameron, Moon and Bygate, 1996; Ofsted, 1999; Nassaji, 2000). As Leung and Franson put it:

... participation in the mainstream curriculum activities does not necessarily lead to efficient content and language learning... the acquisition of general communication skills is only a part of second [additional] language development (in Mohan, Leung and Davison, 2001: 212).

Research evidence suggests that while pupils learn vocabulary and develop oral fluency well in a range of common language patterns, there is a tendency for development to ‘plateau’ as learners rely upon familiar linguistic constructions to fulfil a wide range of purposes. Pupils’ lexical and grammatical resources do not become sufficiently refined and they tend not to develop the range and depth of language resources required for constructing more complex or subtle meanings in specific types of academic discourse.

Traditional, cognitivist linguists describe this in terms of a lack of grammatical competence or accuracy, which has led to a number of educational responses that foreground the formal teaching of grammar as subject (QCA, 1998; DfES, 2002; NLS, 2003). Other work (Derewianka, 1991; Mercer, 1995; Gibbons, 2002), more influenced by socio-cultural theory, suggests that language learners do not necessarily need to learn grammar as a subject, taught explicitly using a technical metalanguage, but they do need to internalise grammatical
In Vygotskyan learning theory, learners develop language and thought as a direct result of interaction with a More Knowledgeable Other (MKO): someone who knows more and can use a broader range of language resources than the learner. In the education context, this could be a teacher or another pupil with whom the learner can talk, collaborate and construct meaning. Mercer (1995: 20) explicitly positions the teacher as a mediator of educational discourses, who supports opportunities for learner agency and empowered language use by structured modelling, guidance and mediation towards desired learning goals. Language development does not take place because of an inherent, ‘natural’ acquisition process but because the learner participates actively in an exchange, a process of collaborative meaning-making and meaning-taking. This is not the same as ‘transmission’ or ‘acquisition’ through immersion but is described as ‘scaffolded learning’ (Bruner, 1975; Gibbons, 2002).

Pupils need ‘scaffolding’ within which to build their linguistic resources. They need clear models of language form provided for both verbal interactions, where recasts and feedback on learners’ utterances can be given, and for written texts, where frameworks, sentence starters, key words and structures, can be provided as external linguistic resources for pupils to draw on. These models should not be generic, context-independent constructions but should be chosen by analysing the actual linguistic demands of the curriculum, arising from the context, subject content, purpose or function and the meanings that need to be expressed. Each learning task and purpose for which language is used places different demands upon learners and each learner has different needs. As Pauline Gibbons asserts, in order for teachers to plan language support effectively, they need to identify what the language demands of the curriculum are and match them to the language resources and needs of the pupils (Gibbons, 2002: 121). This is the challenge for teachers working with additional language learners in the 2008 skills-focused curriculum.
5. Conclusion
The 2008 skills-focused curriculum may offer increased opportunities for additional language development. It contains explicit references to teachers’ responsibilities for supporting additional language learners and it foregrounds the importance of interactive, collaborative learning that can lead to a conducive environment for language development.

The conceptual separation of cognitive ‘thinking’ skills and linguistic ‘communication’ skills in the 2008 curriculum is not helpful as it allows them to be considered separately from one another as organising factors in planning. However, if collaborative learning activities utilise scaffolding and carefully chosen language models as forms of contextual support, there is potential for both to be combined effectively.

With a strong focus on skills, there is a danger that the significance of content meanings in shaping language may be missed. Subordinating choices of subject content beneath a set of generic skills could shift the focus in planning away from meaning towards the design of activities that practise the communicative functions of language in the four skills of Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing, and in which a focus on form is limited to correcting grammatical inaccuracy. If teachers simply perceive language to be playing a communicative role in the service of subject-specific learning objectives, such as ‘recording observations’ in science or ‘answering geographical questions’, then an explicit focus on developing the appropriate forms and patterns of language could still be overlooked.

The recognition in each subject Order that language is used for different purposes may offer potential for linking meaning, function and form in subject learning activities if the language demands of lessons in each subject area are analysed appropriately. In order to ensure that additional language learners are fully included in lessons, teachers must take into account that they may not have age-appropriate understanding of language and comprehension of meaning. When pitching classwork, teachers must make sure that the language arising out of learning activities is differentiated to the language levels, as well as the skills levels, of all the children.
Bibliography


PPI (1998) *Keep it simple, keep it relentless: report of a research project on whole school language policies in the secondary schools of Wales.* PPI group. Cardiff: ACCAC.


3. Support for English as an additional language in secondary schools: a case study

Jenny Cann

Abstract
The focus of this article is a small-scale study undertaken in a large urban secondary school in south Wales. It gives a pupil's eye view of the support received by four children for whom English is an additional language (EAL). Using data from interviews with pupils, together with some background information provided by EAL teachers and from observation of classes, examples of good practice such as the pivotal role of the school's EAL Unit are highlighted. The findings are classified into four areas: new arrivals, on-going support, mainstream teaching and the role of the first language. The conclusions highlight the importance of a whole school approach and formalised systems of support, particularly in relation to new arrivals, as well as the need for a more central role for mainstream teachers in supporting EAL pupils.

Introduction
The aim of this case study was to gain insights, focussing on a specific school, into the experiences of pupils learning English as an additional language and to use these as a basis to make recommendations to the school. The size of the sample of pupils interviewed for the study was limited to four as this was only one element of a larger piece of work. Nevertheless, the insights provided by these pupils are a useful addition to our knowledge base in an area that is of growing concern to schools in Wales.

The school in question is a mixed comprehensive situated on the outskirts of a town in south Wales. It has approximately 1,200 pupils aged 11 to 18 on its roll. According to a recent Estyn inspection report, 34% of the
school’s pupils are entitled to free school meals, which is well above the LEA average. All pupils follow the Welsh national curriculum and support for those who need help with English (189 pupils at the time of the study) is based in the EAL Unit at the school. The Unit is staffed by 2.8 specialist EAL teachers and further backup is provided by a wide range of home-language support assistants, all of whom are funded and managed by the LEA through its Ethnic Minority Services. The EAL Unit has a dedicated room in the school that is attractively decorated and contains a range of language learning resources. Staff at the school reported that the EAL team leader had worked hard for a number of years to ensure that the Unit is seen as an integral part of the school.

**Research sample**

The interview sample was partially planned in that a request had been made to interview pupils at different stages of English but also opportunistic since it also depended on which pupils were in the EAL Unit on the day when interviews were held. In this article the pupils have been assigned pseudonyms to guarantee their anonymity.

Polly is eighteen years old and arrived from Thailand four years ago having attended a mainstream school in Thailand, but with ‘very little’ English. She is estimated at WAG stage C/D in English (see Appendix 1) and is studying for a BTEC in Art and Design. She continues to receive support with written English. At home she speaks English with her stepfather and grandmother and Thai with her mother.

Abdul is eleven years old and comes from Somalia. He has been in the UK for eleven months, spending two months in a primary school before moving up with his new friends to the secondary school where he appears to have settled easily into year 7. He is now at stage B in English and receives regular support covering a range of subjects.

Nada is fourteen and from Lithuania. She has spent three years at the secondary school where it has become apparent that she has learning difficulties and is unable to read or write in either her first language or English. Her spoken English is estimated at stage C and support in class is provided through additional learning support rather than specific EAL provision.
Anna is a seventeen year old Russian who has been in Wales for two years. She arrived with a sound educational background but little English. She has made rapid progress, gaining six GCSE grade Cs the previous summer and is in the first year of A levels in psychology, music and maths. Her English is now at stage C/D but she receives help with written work from both EAL tutors and a Russian speaking language support worker.

As Greene and Hill (2005) recognise:

The nature of any child’s experience is always in part inaccessible to an outsider: this must be a fundamental premise for the researcher. This inaccessibility is even more problematic when children are as yet unable to report on their encounters of the world (Greene and Hill, 2005: 5).

The interviewer was not a member of the school staff and had only met two of the pupils, Abdul and Nada, previously. Abdul is young and relatively new to English but was able to recount his experiences. However, he was not fully able to reflect on or identify real problems or difficulties. Nada, although older and more proficient in English, appeared, at times, to be giving answers that she felt would please the interviewer such as ‘I try not to speak Russian in school because I want my English to get better’ but she also gave very honest answers about her refusal to do homework and her inability to read and write. Since Polly and Anna were older there was, in both cases, a more equal power relationship between interviewer and interviewee (Greene and Hill, 2005) which led to more extensive responses and less interviewer effect.

**Research methods**

Semi-structured interviews were carried out with the four children, using mostly open-ended questions in order to encourage longer responses (Westcott and Littleton, 2005) and to have the opportunity to explore other aspects or to rephrase questions as required. Questions were constructed around areas that had been highlighted as important in the reading of the literature relating to EAL provision in secondary schools (see the interview schedule in Appendix 2).
Responses to the questions in four sections – arrival; language support; mainstream teaching; use of first language in school – have been selected to form the structure of this article. It has been necessary to exclude other relevant areas such as assessment, experience of racism and bullying because they were difficult to explore fully and, in the case of bullying, arguably too sensitive in a situation where the interviewees did not know the interviewer.

The interviews were conducted in a familiar setting, the EAL Unit, and every attempt was made to make the children feel at ease by asking more general questions about hobbies and interests in the initial phase as recommended by Hopkins (1985). In line with Mason’s (2003) recommendations on research ethics, none of the pupils were obliged to participate. The purpose of the interview was explained orally and in writing, and anonymity was assured. The data that have been collected from these interviews represent only a snapshot of the pupils’ experiences and are also affected by the subjectivity of the researcher. The interview data are therefore to be considered as ‘valid as a source of information and suspect as a complete source of understanding’ (Greene and Hill, 2005:7). Discussion with the EAL teachers at the school after the interviews provided useful contextual information about the interviewees and the school in general but the findings from the pupil interviews were not discussed. Two lesson observations were also organised subsequent to the interviews, in which pupils were observed in mainstream lessons and the support provided by the EAL staff within the classroom was also observed. Whilst this does not constitute full triangulation, the two supplementary elements provided a fuller picture of the situation and a sounder basis on which to make recommendations.

The analysis that follows is based on the pupils’ responses to the four main sections of the interviews.

New arrivals
The interviewees were all asked about their first few weeks at school. For Abdul, the transition from primary to secondary school had taken place with the friends he had already made and English language support was arranged on a withdrawal
The type of provision described here is a long way from the segregation from the mainstream of the 1980s ‘language units’ (Spafford and Bolloten, 2006) when pupils, particularly in the big cities, were sent to separate units as it was felt that they could not cope with school if they could not speak English. Subsequent research has shown that immersion in
English with appropriate support, blending withdrawal with gradual induction into the mainstream, is far more successful on all levels. It is an attempt to balance, on the one hand, the need for new arrivals to feel secure and to have their confidence boosted, with, on the other hand, the need to attain integration and the avoidance of practices that could lead to stigmatisation (Gravelle, 2001).

The pastoral role of the EAL Unit was referred to by all the interviewees when asked about advice that they would give to other new arrivals: ‘Come to the EAL room’ (Abdul); ‘If there’s anything you don’t know, ask in here (the EAL Unit)’ (Nada). This role was confirmed by the constant stream of children coming to the room between lessons. Gravelle (2001) is sceptical about the role of the EAL classroom as a ‘place of security’ and underlines the need to address the perceived ‘insecurity’ of the wider school. However, it is also recognised by Rutter (2006) that new arrivals, in particular, may become targets for bullying because of their newness, their lack of fluency in English and other features that make them stand out. It is therefore understandable that pupils may need extra support and a sensible approach is to have a place that serves this function but without developing the kind of ‘learned dependency’ that Blair and Bourne (1998) warn against.

Part of the strategy of promoting integration and independence in pupils at this school is to use buddies and other forms of peer support. All of the pupils interviewed had established friendship groups but they also commented on the importance of having someone with them in lessons to show them where to go and what to do in the initial stages. Three of the pupils (Polly, Nada and Anna) had subsequently acted as buddies for others. Polly had been in a bigger group of new arrivals and she identified the important mutual support that they offered: ‘We were good friends; we learned English together. At the start we could not speak, well only the ones who spoke Arabic, but we made signs and drawings and we used simple English. When I went to lessons or in break I did the same thing with the other pupils and they understood me, they thought it was funny.’

The use of some form of peer support is widely supported in the literature (for example, Rutter, 2006; Frederickson and
Cline, 2002; Gravelle, 2001; Blair and Bourne, 1998; DfES, 2008). In the best examples, teachers discuss the role of buddy with pupils and provide training for that role (Gravelle, 2001). An encounter by the author with three Polish pupils, out with this study, confirms the importance of this. In this case, the pupil with the most English, who had been translating for the two other pupils, had withdrawn his services. When asked why, he stated that although they were from the same country that did not mean that they had to be friends. Frederickson and Cline (2002) cite work on peer tutoring that demonstrates that, as part of an overall inclusion strategy and with proper induction, both ‘tutor’ and ‘tutee’ can benefit in terms of self esteem and academic success.

**On-going English language support**

As an older pupil who arrived with a sound educational background but limited English, Anna’s experiences have been a little different to those of her peers. When she arrived she was given a more traditional form of English support generally associated with adult education: ‘The EAL teachers gave me some work to improve my grammar, reading and writing. After about three months I start to go to lessons with the teacher and after 6 or 7 months I start to go by myself, then I just have my dictionary.’ This progression from withdrawal coupled with in-class support to the individual support on demand that she currently receives is very resource intensive but has enabled her to make rapid progress. She has also had help from a home-language support assistant from the end of year 11.

Despite the ‘widespread understanding’ (Blair and Bourne, 1998: 103) that pupils are most likely to learn English if they are supported in the mainstream alongside their peers, withdrawal of pupils from lessons to give specific support has also been recognised as useful at various stages. As Rutter (2006) found, it is particularly useful at beginner level to support coursework. This was the main form of support received by Polly, and Anna also benefited as a more advanced learner.

Abdul, who is still at an early stage, is withdrawn for at least three lessons a week (mainly English lessons) to
concentrate on his literacy skills. On the day of the interview he was also catching up on some ICT class work that he had found difficult. For practical reasons, he is taught as part of a ‘New to English’ group in the EAL Unit but given differentiated tasks. His confidence and obvious enjoyment of school suggest that this is an appropriate strategy for him. He also receives in-class support and works with an Arabic speaking tutor. As Somali children have been identified as amongst the lowest achievers in Wales (WAG, 2003) his progress will be monitored carefully. The same WAG report highlights the small percentage of low achievers who have been categorised as having reached the higher stages C or D (see Appendix 1) in English and stresses the need for on-going monitoring and periodic support. In practice, limited resources mean that support tends to be concentrated on pupils at stages A and B, as in Abdul’s case.

As Nada has literacy problems she receives support in most of her lessons from a learning support assistant who works with a group of pupils with special educational needs (SEN). This support is not specifically related to EAL but her spoken English is now at a level where she can easily understand and communicate orally in lessons. She maintains contact with the EAL Unit and receives help when needed. Communication between the learning support assistant and the EAL Unit appears limited, as EAL staff are unsure of the exact nature of her learning difficulty. This is surprising as there is a rising number of SEN children at the school who are also learning English as an additional language.

Polly and Anna, the two older pupils, received support with coursework throughout their GCSE years and this support is continuing. Both pupils also mentioned particular problem areas that they are working on. For example, Polly gets help with pronunciation and academic writing. Like many successful learners, her mastery of Basic Interpersonal Communication (Cummins, 1984) masks a deficit in her academic language proficiency. Work on more formal English and its associated structures is identified as important for more advanced learners by writers such as Breen (2002). Anna has a slightly different way of approaching academic work as she arrived in the UK at the age of 15 having had a
rigorous formal education in Russia. This is testified by the ease with which she understood the content of her lessons and the danger she felt that she could ‘become lazy’ in the more relaxed UK system: ‘When I’m writing my essay I first of all write it in Russian and then I translate in English. I think in English now but when I am doing important work I think in Russian first of all because then I can put more important things.’ She is therefore still developing her academic language proficiency in English.

Despite the high level of satisfaction expressed by the pupils with the support that they receive, there are factors that can threaten this level of provision. Budgets are limited and an influx of new arrivals can impact on the support that can be provided for more advanced learners (see also Ofsted, 2003). Anna summarises her view as follows: ‘I would like to have more help when it is just me and the teacher. When there are a lot of people in the room the teacher is more rushed.’ The two older pupils have integrated quickly and done well academically especially since entry at years 10 and 11 is often seen as problematic (Spafford and Bolloten, 2006).

**Mainstream teaching**
Pupils generally receive support in core subjects (mathematics, English and science) while they are at stages A and B in English (WAG, 2003). After this initial period of approximately eighteen months, pupils continue to be monitored formally and informally and support is provided when needed. The four interviewees were asked about the subjects that they enjoyed and those that they found difficult and the reasons for their preferences were explored.

Abdul seemed to be enjoying the full range of subjects, although he said that he hates science and geography homework: ‘It’s too difficult and when I ask my dad he say ‘just do it’.’ Abdul and Anna, for different reasons, seemed to find Mathematics easier than many subjects although it posed problems for Polly. Her case is supported by the work of Frederickson and Cline (2002), who warn that, despite popular assumptions, mathematics is not a ‘universal’ subject. Other research (Barwell 2002, 2005) has highlighted features of mathematics that can make it difficult: its intrinsically abstract
nature; the cultural assumptions that need to be understood when tackling contextually posed problems in English language textbooks; and the specific way in which precise mathematical terminology overlaps with everyday vocabulary. Anna expressed this latter problem of coping with the vocabulary of technical subjects, such as mathematics and science, by noting that it is ‘not just words but the way you have to use them’.

Nada, who has learning difficulties, is now studying a limited number of core subjects but she, like Polly, had difficulty with religious studies. Polly felt that this was because ‘religion is not in my life. I know nothing and the teacher uses lots of words I don’t know.’ When asked whether history presented the same problems, she stated that this was not the case and that this subject is ‘good to know’. In line with much of the research, these interviewees are reporting a mixture of language problems, a lack of contextual knowledge and a range of motivational factors that can make some subjects more difficult than others.

Extensive advice is available to mainstream subject teachers on how to make their lessons more accessible to EAL learners. For example, Key Stage 3 subject guides for teachers (such as DfES, 2002) provide comprehensive advice on inclusive learning, they indicate the key vocabulary that needs to be explained, and they include suggestions regarding both visuals to support lessons and activities to promote collaborative learning and language development. Mainstream teachers have a double task of both delivering the curriculum and supporting EAL pupils in developing their language skills (Cameron, 2002). While all learners, including native English speakers, need support to develop subject-specific and academic language, the needs are far more complex when English is an additional language. Such pupils need more time to understand new language coupled with scaffolded support in order to complete their work (Gibbons, 2002). Within this case study there was no real evidence, either from the lessons that were observed or from discussions with staff and pupils, that such support was routinely available.

In 2003 the English as an Additional Language Association of Wales (EALAW) carried out a survey of 150 mainstream
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It found that 65% of the teachers surveyed had had no training in meeting the needs of EAL pupils. While recognising the small size of the sample, this training gap has also been highlighted elsewhere (Cameron, 2002). Nevertheless some examples of good practice were observed in the classes at the school in this study, including a teacher who had learned and used a few words of a pupil’s home language, a practice supported by Gravelle (2001) as a powerful tool to help newly arrived pupils to feel included. There was also evidence in the form of visual displays that illustrated the universality of areas of the curriculum, such as wall charts on the theme ‘science around the globe’.

The literature on teaching EAL contains wide support for the use of carefully planned pair and group work to help pupils to develop their language and to provide a framework of support in the completion of their work (Gravelle, 2001; Breen 2002; Cameron, 2002; Frederickson and Cline, 2002). However, there was little evidence of such methods being used in the school in this study; Abdul and Nada reported that they always worked on their own in class and Polly and Anna had experienced pair and group work only when it was required for GCSE coursework.

Rutter (2005) noted the lack of use of visual aids, a recognised way of helping to clarify meaning, in the schools that she visited. The pupils in this study reported the occasional use of DVDs or the electronic whiteboard in classes but the use of visual aids did not appear to be common. This was borne out by an observed science lesson on tectonic plates, a subject that lends itself to the use of images and models, which was delivered purely through talk and the text book.

In addition to a lack of appropriate training, a number of other factors could explain why mainstream teachers do not appear to be using recommended strategies to support EAL pupils on a routine basis. As Blair and Bourne (1998) and Breen (2002) have noted, one of the most significant factors is a tendency for subject teachers to view language development as the exclusive responsibility of EAL staff. In this school, the EAL Unit has a high visibility and, as such, has probably been
instrumental in confirming this view. Discussions with EAL staff identified examples of good practice in mainstream classes and subject teachers do turn to EAL staff for advice but many feel constrained by a rigid curriculum and a multitude of other demands. One teacher in Breen’s study, who tried hard to support her EAL pupils, illustrates this pressure on classroom time by stating that ‘unfortunately, you spend a lot of time with those students with behavioural problems’ (Breen, 2002: 108).

As noted above, EAL pupils receive in-class support from members of the EAL team. The recommendations for effective use of this type of support include engagement in joint planning of lessons with mainstream teachers (Gravelle 2001; Breen, 2002; WAG, 2007). This does not happen in the school in this study, and is arguably more feasible in primary schools. Nevertheless, according to one of the EAL teachers, there is informal discussion before, during and after the lessons about progress and strategies, a process that is enhanced by the school’s intranet. She added: ‘We are able to use our discretion and withdraw from an in-class support session if we feel it appropriate.’ This includes instances where the class is doing a test and EAL pupils may be taken to a separate room and provided with clarification or extra time (if needed) or more focussed work on vocabulary related to the topic being studied. EAL staff also have a say in pupil placement on arrival and are able to advise on movement between sets when appropriate. Since they often have the best overview of the pupil’s progress, this can represent good practice (Bourne, 2006).

**Use of first language**

Pupils were asked about the use of their first language both at home and in school. All of the interviewees use their first language at home, including watching television (Nada) and chatting with friends on the internet (Anna). All except Polly felt that they spoke English better than their parents; Polly has an English-speaking stepfather and grandmother who help Polly with her pronunciation. The older pupils are literate in their first language; Abdul and Nada are not. The role of the first language in accessing the second has been extensively
emphasised in the literature although, as Frederickson and Cline (2002) point out, in the National Curriculum guidance this is mostly seen as a route to learning standard English, and this is essentially the perspective adopted by the school in this study. Although home-language support assistants are present, they mainly discuss work from lessons in order to make it accessible. Nevertheless, as Gravelle (2001) states, this can mean that conceptual understanding is developed in both English and the home language, and status can be accorded to some pupils’ first languages when they are offered as subjects to be studied in their own right at GCSE level.

**Conclusions**

The pupils in the study are happy with the English language support that they receive to improve their skills in English. The EAL Unit responds to the individual needs of pupils when they arrive and as they progress through the school. The Unit provides them with a point of contact in the initial stages and promotes the development of valuable support networks that assist with pupils’ integration into the mainstream. Resources are necessarily limited and the unpredictability of the arrival of new pupils of any age and at any time during the school year is a constant challenge for the Unit and the school as a whole. Although the Welsh Assembly Government’s funding formula gives a higher weighting for new arrivals who have no English, it is allocated on an historical basis and never fully reflects the actual provision (WAG, 2007).

At present the school does not have a formal policy regarding new arrivals. The recommendations in a management guide prepared by the UK Government (DFES, 2008) could provide it with a useful starting point. Such a policy could also incorporate training and reward systems for pupils who act as buddies at the school, which would enhance its current practice.

The EAL team leader has been very active in promoting the EAL Unit and in establishing its status within the school. Nevertheless, this study has highlighted the need for better communication between all departments in the school with EAL staff. Mainstream teachers who have EAL pupils in their
classes could be encouraged to seek advice on how they can develop supportive practices in their teaching, and those working in other specialist services such as learning support need to share information and discuss pupils’ needs. Blair and Bourne (1998) suggest that this could be achieved through the use of voluntary ‘contracts’ where roles and responsibilities are clarified.

The children in this study identified positive features of the support that they received from specialist teachers. However, the formal government policy is that funding should not be used to extend the use of separate support but that mainstream teachers should be trained to extend EAL pupils’ language skills themselves (WAG, 2003; Rutter, 2006). This is a challenge both for teacher trainers and for those responsible for continuing professional development programmes.
Appendix 1: Stages of English as an Additional Language Acquisition
(adapted from WAG, 2003)

(These definitions are in common use, although some of the detail remains debatable.)

**Stage A** – New to English
May use first language for learning and other purposes. May remain completely silent in the classroom. May be copying/repeating some words or phrases. May understand some everyday expressions in English but may have minimal or no literacy in English. **Needs a considerable amount of EAL support.**

**Stage B – Early Acquisition**
May follow day to day social communication and participate in learning activities. Beginning to use spoken English for social purposes. May understand simple instructions and can follow narrative/accounts with visual support. May have developed some skills in reading and writing. May have become familiar with some subject specific vocabulary. **Still needs a significant amount of support to access curriculum fully.**

**Stage C – Developing Competence**
May participate in learning activities with increasing independence. Able to express self orally in English, but structural inaccuracies are still apparent. Literacy will require ongoing support, particularly for understanding text and writing. May be able to follow abstract concepts and more complex written English. **Requires ongoing EAL support to access the curriculum fully.**

**Stage D – Competent**
Oral English will be developing well, enabling successful engagement in activities across the curriculum. Can read and understand a wide variety of texts. Written English may lack complexity and contain occasional evidence of errors in structure. Needs some support to access subtle nuances of
meaning, to refine English usage, and to develop abstract vocabulary. **Needs some occasional EAL support to access complex curriculum material and tasks.**

**Stage E – Fluent**
Can operate across the curriculum to a level of competence equivalent to that of a pupil who uses English as his/her first language. **Operates without EAL Support across the curriculum.**
Appendix 2: Interview Questions

General Questions

What do you like doing when you’re not at school?
Tell me about your family. Who lives with you?
What language do you speak at home?
How long have you lived in the UK?
How long have you been at the school?
Where did you go to school before that?

Arrival

Can you remember your first year at this school? What do you remember? (further prompts: What did you like doing? Why? Who helped you most? Who were your friends?)

Mainstream Subjects

Tell me about school now.
What are you good at?
What are your favourite subjects? Why do you like them?
Are there any lessons or subjects you don’t like? Why?
Who are your favourite teachers? Why?
(ask about maths if not already mentioned)
Do you get a chance to work in groups or pairs with other pupils? Do you like this? Why (not)? Who do you usually work with?
Do your teachers use electronic whiteboards, computers, pictures, DVDs, TV programmes, anything else in the lessons?
Do you think this is a good idea? Why?
Are there any subjects where there is new language that is difficult to understand? What do you do if you don’t understand?

Help with English

What help do you have with your English now? Do you think you need more/less or is it about right?
Has this changed from other years?
What kinds of things do/did you do with the EAL teachers that you think are really good? Why?
Do you have help from a bilingual teacher? What do you do with him/her? Do you think this helps you with your school work?
Can you think of anything that the EAL teachers have shown you to do that is really useful?

**Use of First Language**

Do you use (first language) in school? In what situations? (Why not?)
Do you use any translation tools, a bilingual dictionary,...? Does anyone help you with your homework if you need it? (Try to probe parental support if possible, Do they help?, Can they help?)

**Recommendations**

What about pupils who have just arrived in the school? What do you think the school should do to help them settle in? What are the best ways for them to learn English quickly?
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4. Experiences of immersion education in Wales in Key Stages 2 and 3

Cen Williams

Abstract
This paper analyses two contemporary examples of immersion education in Wales to promote the teaching of Welsh to pupils as they transfer from the primary to the secondary sector. The methodology used to teach Welsh in these examples is set out together with the conditions that secure success. The conclusions include a recommendation to establish a framework to create and to coordinate a national strategy to build further on this success.

1. Introduction
The focus of this paper is the teaching methodology used in two contemporaneous immersion education schemes in Wales, both of which were launched during the school year 2003–04. One of these schemes is based at Gwynedd’s Language Centre for Latecomers at Porthmadog (the Centre), which caters for secondary pupils in the county, and the other covers the Welsh immersion and intensive language teaching pilot projects that are being trialled in primary and secondary schools across Wales (the Immersion Pilot). These pilot projects, initially based on three clusters of primary schools, were established by the Welsh Language Board at the request of the Welsh Assembly Government as part of its strategy to achieve the aims set out in its policy document Iaith Pawb (WAG, 2003; see also the report by Estyn, 2006).

The paper explores some of the teaching and learning methods that are used, principally at the Centre, and the strategies employed by the Welsh Language Board to prepare secondary subject teachers to adjust to a new role that is critical to the success of the Immersion Pilot. But first, some of the principles informing the research and theory that
underpin the immersion education and intensive language teaching that are relevant to both schemes are discussed.

Gwynedd’s experience of supporting and managing centres for latecomers dates from the 1970s and that model (with some local adjustments) has also been adopted in other counties in Wales. But these were centres for primary age latecomers. The setting up of a centre for secondary pupils was a new and innovative development. The Centre at Porthmadog caters mainly for year 7 pupils but its remit has been extended to include year 8 and some year 9 pupils.

Pupils who attend primary centres do so for a whole term (normally between 10 and 12 weeks) and they develop sufficient mastery of Welsh to allow them to proceed smoothly thereafter to their local bilingual secondary school. The linguistic development of the best of these pupils in Welsh can fairly be described as ‘miraculous’ but all pupils who benefit from this system have achieved a sufficient mastery for their own purposes. By contrast, secondary pupils attending the Centre did so only for six weeks initially, although this period was extended to eight weeks in the second year of the scheme. Their linguistic development over that period is also remarkable but it has to be understood that the Centre’s role is to establish a base for further development and that the secondary schools receiving pupils need to build on that base.

The same is the case for the Immersion Pilot. Pupils receive up to six weeks intensive immersion education at the end of Key Stage 2 prior to transfer to their secondary school. Although there are some local variations, this experience is generally provided at the secondary school, the travel costs being borne by the local authority or the project. Secondary teachers (sometimes with the assistance of athrawon bro) are responsible for the provision and, following the summer break, pupils are transferred to the secondary school that had responsibility for their intensive period of immersion education.

It follows that the success of both schemes depends critically on the follow-up provided at the secondary school. The relevant secondary subject teachers are key to that success. They are therefore the focus of attention in staff development sessions (see the Conclusion). By virtue of their day-to-day roles, they are able to develop language through
subject content, thus more closely replicating the way in which language is acquired naturally.

1.1 The basic principles and research findings that inform the teaching of language through subject content

Teddick, Jorgenson and Geffert (2001) note:

It has long been established in the research on immersion education that content-based language instruction works. That is, students who participate in immersion programs not only become proficient in the immersion language, they also achieve academically as evidenced by their performance on standardized achievement tests (Teddick et al., 2001: 2).

Immersion education is a success story, a fact that needs to be emphasised. Pupils who experience immersion become competent in a new language and achieve academic success through the medium of that language. But we don’t need to visit other countries to see the evidence for that; it has been happening here in Wales for at least forty years. In the bilingual or Welsh-medium schools of the south-east or north-east the vast majority of the pupils learn Welsh through immersion education at school rather than at home. The secondary schools then build on this success so that their second language develops as an academic language as well. They succeed academically in their content subjects through the medium of their second language. But by then they have two first languages, both Welsh and English; that is the extent of the success and the value of immersion education for us in Wales. The education system needs to recognise this success and to learn how to use aspects of immersion education to make up for the relative failure of learning Welsh as a subject in the majority of our English-medium schools. If our intent is to create a bilingual Wales, we need to capitalise on what is already happening here in the Welsh-medium sector and in other countries, and extend immersion education to English-medium schools.
Grabe and Stoller (1997) emphasise the increased motivation afforded by immersion education, together with enhanced employment opportunities:

Research has shown that content-based instruction results in language learning, content learning, increased motivation and interest levels, and greater opportunities for employment (where language abilities are necessary).

Pupils are motivated to learn an additional language because of their interest in the subjects being taught and the transmission of subject content through the medium of the new language.

Various research studies show that one of the important features of the teaching of subject content through the medium of a second language is that language is thereby acquired within natural and meaningful contexts:

Natural language acquisition occurs in context; natural language is never divorced from meaning, and content-based instruction provides a context for meaningful communication to occur (Teddick et al., 2001: 2; the article also refers to the work of others in the field).

In the absence of a designated body whose role would be to provide sound advice on the basis of examples of good practice, the situation in Wales remains based on a traditional view of second-language learning wherein Welsh is regarded as a subject rather than as a medium of learning. As often as not, the only link between individual words and sentence construction is the semantic link; learning a language is more akin to solving a puzzle rather than being engaged with real and meaningful activity. The aim of the learning is purely linguistic, often leading to repetition and the use of uninspiring and monotonous exercises. But we cannot deceive 21st century children! They quickly lose interest and cannot see a purpose to their learning.

Teddick et al. (2001) catalogue a number of other advantages that accrue from learning a second language through subject content. Those advantages give subject teachers confidence in what they are trying to achieve and show how the educational experience can be enriched.
1.2 The principles underpinning both schemes

The development of language is a necessary focus of attention during both the periods of intensive teaching and in the Welsh language lessons. As both schemes got under way, it was necessary to consider which underpinning philosophy of language development to adopt as being most appropriate to serve that purpose. In that context it was instructive to consider the development of second-language teaching in Wales during the periods leading up to these schemes.

In the 1970s the emphasis was on formal grammatical teaching. Teachers would lead the whole class, as one might lead a choir, to answer questions based solely on grammatical niceties. Natural communication was not the aim of the lesson. Rather, priority was given to manipulating sentence patterns and vocabulary; pupils learnt atomised bits of language rather than how to use Welsh socially. Many individuals managed to hide behind the choral recitation. Teaching had a purely linguistic aim divorced from everyday life.

The period after the 1970s signalled a change of emphasis with the development of situational learning, whereby sufficient language was acquired to cope with particular situations and contexts. Core phrases and vocabulary were introduced to discuss the weather or to buy something in a shop, or to place an order by phone. However, the phrases were often complex and unconnected and learners could not easily discern any underlying sequences or patterns. Because their learning had been short-term and focused on very particular situations, pupils could not transfer language patterns from one situation to another. In an essay prepared for Cyd (an organisation with the aim of helping Welsh learners to cross the bridge between being learners and being people who are confident and happy to use the language naturally in a wide range of everyday situations) R.M. (Bobi) Jones argues (in translation) as follows:

Following the 1970s much language learning in Wales became modelled on traveller ‘phrase book’ patterns. A number of fairly complex sentences are introduced to fulfill particular functions. There is no attempt to build a structure, brick by brick. Listing
twenty handy French phrases can be useful for a week’s holiday in France. But that is no way to build up a language. No framework is presented and the learner is unable to adapt methodically to form new sentences. In order to learn a language effectively, sentence constructions must be learned sequentially, one by one. Learning arithmetic is an appropriate comparator. It would be foolish to learn to multiply before learning to add, and even more foolish to learn fractions before learning to count (Jones, 2003: 7).

Pupils would, therefore, be able to communicate briefly within the limited confines of the language they had acquired, but they were unable to develop linguistically. This was a constant theme in Estyn reports – pupils who appeared to be learning quickly in the early stages would then stagnate linguistically after reaching a particular level. The following quotations are representative of comments in such reports:

Pupils lack confidence and fluency when they use a limited range of phrases and sentences and a few are reluctant to contribute.

In both key stages, a significant number of pupils do not make statements or offer responses voluntarily.

When questioned individually, a significant number of pupils have difficulty remembering vocabulary and simple phrases. Pupils are often hesitant and lack confidence. A significant number of pupils in KS2 do not yet have sufficient use of a wide enough vocabulary or a comprehensive range of sentence structures.

The challenge is to adopt a philosophy that presents language as a medium of communication that develops sequentially and is also relevant to everyday reality. Bobi Jones proposes such a method in his discussion of course development:

The developer’s first task is to devise a graduated structural scheme, starting with the core sentence. Then, the language can be built up meaningfully, variation by variation and extension by extension. This should be as orderly, clear and consistent as possible.
That establishes the basic resource: a more or less complete scale of patterns. The second resource is the vocabulary, or the situational core – functions or notions however they are described (Jones, 2003: 8).

He therefore advocates beginning with a graduated scheme based on phrases or sentences. The vocabulary comes next and Bobi Jones equates the vocabulary with the situational core, in that situations exist and develop for the learner through the related vocabulary.

In broad terms, the design of courses for both schemes was based on the principle of presenting sentence structures encompassing:

- **basic phrases and vocabulary** in Welsh that pupils could transfer from one situation and context to another
- **classroom and school communication language**, common to many subjects
- **basic subject-related phrases** in subjects such as mathematics, religious education, history and geography that provide a foundation for subject teachers on which to build further.

2. **Some of the teaching methods**

2.1 **Use of the first or the second language**

In a recent study by the author of pupils experiencing late immersion in a particular secondary school (Williams, 2002) it was noticed that teachers were able to improve pupils’ understanding of both grammar and the subject by teaching bilingually. In language lessons the teacher used English to support Welsh in discussing grammar and to accelerate learning:

Teacher: Beth ydi enw dy frawd. Be careful of that ‘dy’ where you put it. Beth ydi enw dy frawd O.K.? Beth ydi enw dy frawd ne beth ydi enw ____? What are your brothers’ names? Sut dach chi’n deud **brothers**? ..........Dy frodyr. Dy frodyr. Da iawn. O.K. Chwionydd, mae run peth; **same thing** ynte. Wel rwan ta beth am yr ysgol? Beth am yr ysgol? **What are the questions you’d need to ask to get answers?** Huw?
It may also be argued that the teacher is using English here to generate a zone of comfort for the learners by respecting their first language. Later in their development, he used English to achieve two other purposes:

(i) to sweeten the pill – when rejecting an incorrect response, as if implying that a light rebuke in the first language is more effective and less severe on the pupil:

Teacher  Beth ydi dy lliwiau ysgol?  (repeating the pupil’s response)  
That’s wrong as well. Now, come on. Who can correct it for me? David?

(ii) to respond to a pupil’s answer in English, before gradually turning it back to Welsh:

Teacher  What you wear, and you’re going to ask in English.......  
No no no. Rwan ta, Cymraeg. Sud dach chi’n gofyn yn Gymraeg?

The teacher uses ‘No no no’ as a kind of false rebuke in order to switch the language back to Welsh. In the first example the teacher himself chooses to use English; in the second example he is led by the pupil.

In the subject lessons, teachers used the pupils’ first language to establish understanding at the beginning of the period of immersion. All subjects were taught through the medium of Welsh from the start and it was therefore important to establish an initial understanding. As the pupils gained more confidence in their use of Welsh, so their use of their first language gradually diminished.

The use of this method was also considered in the context of the Centre but, in this case, it was decided that Welsh would be used exclusively by the teacher both to explain curricular content and as a medium of general communication. Exceptions were made during the first week or two to ensure full understanding when it was clear that a pupil had misunderstood. It was also agreed that anyone could turn to English if safety considerations outweighed linguistic aims.

The transcript below from the second week illustrates the practice. Although the pupils’ language is very restricted at
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this stage, the teacher makes time during the day to hold numerous conversations with each pupil on an individual basis:

T    Sud wyt ti Pippa?
P    Go lew
T    Pam?
P    Wedi blino?
T    Be wnest ti neithiwr?
P    Ffilm
T    Be oedd o?
P    (Unclear response)
T    Comedi ydi hi? Ffilm ramantus?
P    Comedi?
T    Ar fideo oedd hi?
P    Ar y teledu

It needs to be emphasised that immersion at the school is significantly different to immersion at the Centre. In the case of the school:

- A more extended period was available to reach a situation in which only the target language was used; pupils would be together as a teaching group for a period of two years before being integrated with first language classes. Nevertheless, by the second term more of the teaching was exclusively through the medium of the second language (Welsh).
- Pupils were only taught by language specialists in lessons focussing on Welsh as a language; the other teachers were subject specialists whose main objective was to teach subject content, skills and concepts. If it appeared that the pupil was unable to understand through the medium of the second language, the teacher’s natural response was to switch to the pupil’s first language and to give priority to the subject.
- Helping pupils to settle into their new school was the main priority in the first few weeks, although they were also exposed to the second language in every lesson.
In the case of the Centre:

- Pupils attended the Centre for only six weeks before they and the Centre’s work were assessed, in terms of the pupils’ ability to understand and use Welsh, by the schools to which they returned.
- They needed to be immersed in an environment that would accelerate an active use of their second language and it was considered that they would be less likely to achieve that aim were they able to use their first language at the start.
- For some lessons (e.g. Physical Education), they joined other teaching groups in the secondary school at which the Centre was based. As they represented a small number within these groups, the teachers were not expected to change their normal medium of instruction. Their exposure to an exclusively Welsh environment at the Centre prepared them well for this situation.
- By communicating in Welsh, they realised from the first day the importance of both listening carefully and of striving to understand, to generate words, comments and sentences and generally to make themselves understood from the outset. The situation generated a strong motivation and enhanced expectations.

The same principle also informed the Immersion Pilot.

2.2 Some teaching methodologies

2.2.1 The base
At the Centre the grammatical base that informs the teaching derives from the vocabulary and sentence structures used either within the context of natural classroom communication or within some specific subject areas. Language patterns are introduced fairly formally in the classroom through drill and (to a lesser extent) substitution, and by introducing both positive and negative responses to questions simultaneously. There is then ample opportunity to repeat these patterns during
succeeding days and to return to them in a natural way on
many other occasions during the course.

The following sentence structures exemplify the practice:

| Sut wyt ti Pippa? | Go lew |
| Pam? | Wedi blino? |
| Be wnest ti neithiwr? | Ffilm |

After introducing these structures during the first week, the teacher often makes use of them during early morning conversations:

T | Sud wyt ti Haydn?
P | Go lew T | Pam? Be wnest ti neithiwr? (no response) Est ti i’r clwb? Est ti i chwarae snwcer?

Note that 'Be sy’n bod?' (‘What’s the matter?’) has changed by now to 'Pam?' (‘Why?’). Neither the teacher nor the pupils keep to the same stock sentences and the conversation is thereby more natural. The teacher’s response varies as pupils gain more language, although conversations continue to begin with the same sentence structures that were introduced during the first week:

T | Sud wyt ti Sarah?
P | Iawn diolch, sud wyt ti? T | Be gest ti i swper?
P | Pysgod (followed by an extended conversation)

Within this context, structures are not learned mechanically only to be swiftly forgotten. Rather, basic structures are mastered and a variety of ways of extending conversations is introduced. Pupils are thereby provided with the basic tools of conversational and occasional language and are given the opportunity to gain the necessary confidence to cope with real situations.
At the same time pupils begin to be introduced to subject content in Welsh. For example, during the first week there is an emphasis on vocabulary, questions and sentences that occur frequently within mathematics.

2.2.2 Using dialogue
It may be argued that introducing dialogue represents an alternative form of situational or notional functional teaching that may be used by teachers to introduce sentences of varied complexity that respond to specific contexts. Without thinking through its wider potential, that may indeed be its only purpose.

By contrast, at the Centre dialogue has many other purposes, including to introduce and strengthen sentence structures. When the teacher was asked to specify her precise purpose, she provided an example of a dialogue used during the second week together with a list of her related general and specific objectives:

Cef Helo, ym...bore da. Sut dach chi?
Siôn Iawn dloich. Y...Pwy wyt ti?
Cef Cefyn ydw i. Fi di Cefyn Cŵl.
Siôn Cefyn Cŵl ia?
Cef 1a. Oes gen ti broblem?
Siôn Nag oes, ond mae gen ti broblem.
Cef Pam?
Siôn Rwyt ti’n gwisgo clustdlysau.
Cef Ydw. Pam lai?
Siôn Rheolau’r ysgol. Dim clustdlysau yn yr ysgol.
Cef O! Twll o le di hwn.

1 Introduce the following patterns: Oes gen ti? Oes/Nag oes.
2 Introduce the idioms: ‘twll o le,’ ‘pam lai?’ I aim to include at least one idiom in every dialogue.
3 Enjoyment is an important component of learning.
4 Encouraging the use of substitution and extending the dialogue.
5 Dialogue is an essential part of the types of conversation pupils are likely to experience.
6 Learning by heart is important.
7 Many additional language patterns can be introduced through dialogue.
She also notes how one of the pupils had remembered the sentence "Oes gen ti broblem?" ('Do you have a problem with that?') and had used it in another context later that day and when he went out during the evening. Objectives 1, 2, 4 and 7 include specific linguistic purposes; the others are important objectives of a general nature. The linguistic framework thereby supports the teaching.

2.2.3 Using reading passages

From the outset short reading passages are used as part of the course theme, which is based on an imaginary school, Ysgol Dolgoch. The acquisition of vocabulary and phrases in this context helps the pupils when they return to their schools in terms of their ability, on the one hand, to talk with their teachers and to cope with basic subject matter, and, on the other hand, to converse with their friends and to tune in to the informal style of talking amongst young people. New phrases are introduced and emphasised a week at a time and other linguistic elements, such as mutations, are confined to the simpler examples that the pupils may already have encountered or are about to encounter.

The following is an example from the second week, together with the teacher’s comments again:

Cefyn

Cefyn ydw i. Rydw i’n ddeuddeg oed. Rydw i’n byw yn Dolgoch.
Mae gen i un brawd ac un chwaer. Enw fy mrawd ydy Dafydd ac enw fy chwaer ydy Elin.
Mae gen i bedwar clustdlws ac mae gen i wallt melyn cyrliog. Does gen i ddim anifail anwes ond mae gen i barot.
(‘I’m Kevin. I’m twelve years old. I live in Dolgoch.
I have one brother and one sister. My brother’s name is Dafydd and my sister’s name is Elin.
I have four earrings and yellow curly hair. I don’t have any pets but I have a parrot.)

1 Presentation of a character to the whole class using a chart.
2 Reading aloud and revising language patterns e.g. ‘Mae gen i’, ‘Does gen i ddim’.
3 Introduction of a new pattern e.g. ‘Enw fy mrawd ydy’.
4 Revision of (i) numbers e.g. twelve (ii) time – the patterns for telling the time had been introduced in the introductory week (iii) colours e.g. yellow hair.
5 Extension of animal-related vocabulary e.g. dog, cat, rabbit had already been introduced and parrot is added here.

2.2.4 Other second language teaching techniques

(i) Pronunciation and methods of presentation

When presenting reading passages in the Centre the normal procedure is as follows:

- the teacher reads and the pupils listen
- the teacher draws attention to the pronunciation of some words, now and again asking the pupils as a group to repeat a word or a mutation or a phrase in its context
- the class reads together as a group, with the teacher interrupting as necessary to draw attention to particular pronunciations and giving an opportunity to the whole group and to chosen individuals to repeat the correct pronunciation
- pupils play roles and read in pairs (dialogue) or one pupil reads aloud to the other pupil (reading passages)
- the teacher asks questions about the content (in some cases) or extends the dialogue in writing and/or orally
- in the case of some dialogues a learning task is set as homework and then, the following morning, the dialogue is extended orally in pairs before being performed (everyone practicing at the same time before presenting the dialogue to the rest of the class).

(ii) Drilling

The teacher uses short periods of drilling with the whole class to introduce new content, such as vocabulary, phrases and grammatical points or to introduce dialogues and reading
passages. The practice often switches suddenly to focus on an individual, picking out a particular pupil to respond and then repeating the question to other individuals, although there may be some variation in the responses (see the example in 2.2.1).

2.2.5 Reading
Reading is emphasised from the beginning. It is mainly used to introduce dialogues and reading passages that have been prepared specifically for this course, and pupils take home simple books to read during the evening. The Centre has a stock of such books targeted at the junior level as well as books specifically designed for learners. Despite the fact that these books are intended for chronologically younger pupils, experience has shown that pupils enjoy reading them.

Reading helps learners:

(i) to link sound with the written form and to recognise words more quickly in print and in dictionaries
(ii) to see how a word may be split up rather than relying solely on how they hear the word
(iii) to feel more independent in their learning as they are able to turn to the printed form to confirm a pattern or a word etc.
(iv) to take Welsh home with them to an otherwise non-Welsh environment as they are required to take home simple reading books as homework every night.

2.2.6 Writing
There is also an emphasis from the beginning on writing short snippets. Every child is expected to keep a homework diary and, at the end of every day, to record what happened that day. At the beginning pupils naturally need considerable assistance to complete this task and the teacher dictates what is to be written in the diaries, writing many of the words on the ‘day’ board.
In that way, rather than by simply copying, pupils have to face the challenge of thinking of simple words for themselves, of thinking phonetically and/or remembering specific spellings. As time passes, the teacher gives less of a lead, other than helping pupils to recall the day’s events, and the writing becomes progressively freer. Also from the outset, pupils use specially designed worksheets requiring them to write individual words or short phrases. This often happens in the context of subject-focused work.

They are also expected to try to write freely from the early stages of their time at the Centre.
The advantage of doing this so early in the course is to encourage pupils to:

(i) sort out their thoughts in their second language through thinking and seeing as well as by listening and talking (the underlying principle being that involving as many of the senses as possible accelerates and reinforces the learning)

(ii) consolidate in writing (i.e. in another linguistic mode) material learned orally, as regular interaction between the various language modes is an important factor in achieving mastery
(iii) take an active role in their learning by being required to search in dictionaries and asking for the appropriate words

(iv) focus on a word’s precise spelling; such a focus would not necessarily result from reading alone as the processes are intrinsically different – the effective reader is one who can spot reading clues in a text without having to pay detailed attention to the precise structure of words but, in order to develop to be an accurate speller, that structure is of paramount importance and fluency in spelling can only be achieved by writing

(v) take an active role in trying to bring words together to form sentences and thereby having to think for themselves as to how sentences are formed in Welsh (and to identify the basic differences between the process in English and the same process in Welsh).

2.3 Good teaching practices
Thus far we have been discussing teaching methodology and the use of linguistic skills, but as the pupils developed more active confidence in Welsh it also became necessary to consider other educational good practices.

2.3.1 Ensuring continuity of experience
One particular example of good practice used extensively by teachers of Welsh as a first language is to secure a logical continuity of activity so as to ensure that the learning is supported by the various linguistic skills. This is clearly in place by the time pupils begin the second half of their period at the Centre. A reading exercise can lead to an oral exercise, itself proceeding to a writing exercise followed by an acting exercise and so on. Another example of good practice is the method used to change from passive to active language.

2.3.2 Changing passive language to active language
By the end of the fourth week pupils have received and understood much passive language. They are also able to generate many examples of active language within normal
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communicative situations. This is the type of language they use daily in the early morning question and answer sessions and is the type of language they are more likely to use with each other.

As all learners of a second language know, it requires considerable confidence to generate ideas and comments in that language. This is particularly true when learners are exposed to new situations or when they tackle new subjects. As we listen to others, we may feel that we have a secure understanding of what is being said, but generating our own language to reflect that understanding may be problematic. Our main problem is that the stock of words and phrases available to us in our second language is inadequate to convey that which we would want to say in our first language.

Too often in the past, inexperienced teachers would give pupils oral tasks for which they had insufficient background knowledge. Second language pupils, even more so, need to be provided with both the relevant background knowledge and the linguistic skills in order to complete the task. The pupils therefore need to be fully prepared. One of the methods for doing so at the Centre is outlined below. Subject teachers need to think through (i) any new vocabulary needed by pupils to be able to follow, understand and respond to the lesson (ii) what questions they themselves would ask (iii) which sentence structures pupils are likely to need in their written responses (iv) how to enable pupils to use new vocabulary and sentence structures actively.

The communicative situation presented to pupils at the Centre was unfamiliar to them in their second language. They were required to complain about something they had bought or been given. This required the use of new vocabulary and phrases together with rapid and effective communication. Pupils could also reverse their roles within their pairs so that they then needed to use language to respond to a complaint by both arriving at a compromise solution and refuting requests for any refund.

Step (i) Learning the correct use of 'rhy' (as in 'rhy fawr' for 'too big') as this word and its associated phrases would be useful in such a situation. This had been introduced the
previous day in order to give the idea time to take root. Consequently, the construction only needed to be revised briefly prior to the class activity.

**Step (ii)** The teacher introduces a situation similar to the one to be acted out by the pupils, talking through the stages, making appropriate comments and feeding in relevant phrases.

**Step (iii)** Drilling contrasting patterns such as ‘Mae o ... o ddym o ddim ...’ (‘It is ... but it is not ...’) in order to establish sentence structures that could be useful in the specific context set for the pupils.

**Step (iv)** Reading together a section of text to provide a possible model for the type of conversation that could develop within the situation.

**Step (v)** Presenting a sheet describing different situations for each pair, similar to the situation introduced in Step (ii) with one pupil complaining about something but in a variety of contexts e.g. in a shoe shop, in a cafe, at the library. Each pair then prepares and practices its oral dialogue.

**Step (vi)** Each pair makes a brief presentation to the class, the teacher assisting and supporting as required.

**Step (vii)** A second situation is presented to each pair and roles are reversed – after preparation, the pair makes a further class presentation.

The teacher’s thorough preparation enabled her pupils to convert their extensive passive command of language to an active mode.

As an example within subject teaching, the same attention to detail based on revising vocabulary and phrases related to the weather enabled pupils to prepare a full weather forecast in writing and orally.

### 3. Preparing subject teachers

Secondary subject teachers form the cornerstone of the success of both schemes discussed in this paper. The teachers involved in the intensive periods are now experienced language teachers and know how to respond to all types of learners and to a range of different situations.

The subject teachers are experts in their subject and, in most cases, neither their initial training nor their subsequent
experience has prepared them to teach pupils in immersion education regarding:

- the type of language development that may be expected of these pupils from term to term and from year to year
- how that may adversely affect their subject
- the various techniques they could use during the first weeks to restrict how much of their second language pupils need to use in order to concentrate on the subject content
- their own use of language as teachers.

As a consequence, the directors of the Immersion Pilot believed that subject teachers needed specific training to help them gain confidence to face new linguistic scenarios in the teaching of their subject. In April 2008 a training programme was launched for 23 subject teachers representing 9 secondary schools. This was a four-day course, the final two-day block being held roughly two months after the initial two days. During the final two days teachers discussed and evaluated the ideas that they had trialled in their schools. The Appendix lists the information sent to schools: a résumé of the course rationale, its objectives and content, the methodology adopted including the follow-up to the course, and the long-term aim.

From 2006 onwards four groups of subject teachers attended a series of one-day courses, which presented and explained some of the teaching methods outlined in parts 2 and 3 of this paper. The four-day course is an important development that improves on the initial one-day courses because:

i. more attention is paid to the development of the individual pupil’s language and to the teachers’ language
ii. extensive use is made of an adapted version of an American course devised for the same target group and meeting the same purpose, although for a different language (CARLA, 1999-2006)
iii. teachers are expected to trial aspects of what is presented to them during the first two days with their immersion classes and to feed back in the two-day follow-up

iv. teachers can consult the scheme’s Director of Staff Development during the period of preparation and trialling or invite him to the school to provide advice

v. the scheme trains a cohort of leaders in the field of immersion education, preparing them to be able to lead discussions within their own schools and to share their experience with other schools

vi. teachers’ contributions and experiences feed in to the development of a final training pack in order to ensure that the training is valid and relevant, building both on classroom experience in Wales and also on the theories and experience of educationists in Wales and beyond

vii. the course opens the possibility to work with teachers and schools on issues such as ‘Subject Thresholds’ in order to develop a clearer picture of when immersion education pupils may be considered to have reached the same level as first language pupils with respect to their development in aspects of subject study.  

4. Conclusion
Most of the principles and research tenets that underpin immersion education in Canada and the USA are also in evidence here in Wales. Our methods and ideologies stand comparison with those of international world leaders. By systematically placing more emphasis on some aspects such as teacher training, pupils’ linguistic development and the use of language by teachers themselves, we can strengthen and disseminate what we have already achieved.

Schemes such as the two discussed in this paper have established a strong base in Wales for intensive immersion

---

10 Counties such as Gwynedd and Môn regard Level 3 Writing Welsh (i.e. first language) as the required language threshold to follow a subject through the medium of Welsh. Subject teachers and many educationists feel that it is also necessary to consider thresholds from the perspective of subject needs. This threshold may vary as between practical and more academic subjects.
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Education and the participating teachers have developed a valuable expertise. They are now confident in their work and build continually on their skills and teaching techniques. In addition, they produce teaching resources that are both valuable and varied, albeit that they tend to be localised in their focus. It is therefore not possible to transfer these resources en bloc to other parts of Wales, but they represent a resource model that could be adapted to fit the needs of any locality. The teachers are either secondary Welsh specialists or athrawon bro (and they also include the occasional primary teacher who has been involved in the intensive teaching team within the Immersion Pilot). They are all therefore language specialists but ways need to be found to share this expertise, both with teachers in the primary sector and with other secondary teachers of Welsh in the Welsh/bilingual sector and in the English-medium sector. This is essential if the Welsh Assembly Government is to achieve its laudable aim of creating a bilingual Wales as outlined in Iaith Pawb (WAG, 2003).

A firm foundation has therefore been established for the periods of intensive immersion. However, such is not always the case regarding subject teachers. Some of these teachers find themselves facing a relatively new experience of trying to present knowledge, skills and concepts related to their subject in a successful way to pupils whose grasp of the language of classroom communication does not match that of first language speakers. They are, nevertheless, not all in the same boat, because some schools have had experience of accepting such pupils for many years. Teachers’ innate skills and their sense of sympathy and empathy often allow them to adapt their own language and their teaching techniques to ensure success. Every school’s experience certainly indicates that the great majority of immersion education pupils reach a perfectly acceptable standard to allow them to participate in mainstream Welsh-medium classes by year 9. Some make the transfer to study some subjects with first language speakers by the start of year 7, others during year 7 and others in year 8. The aim is to accelerate each pupil’s development and to provide every subject teacher with the confidence that he or she can use acceptable methods and techniques that have
been used by other teachers and proved to be successful in other situations.

The current training scheme was, therefore, established for the benefit of those subject teachers who teach pupils who experience immersion education from the beginning of year 7 or who will be teaching those pupils in years 8 and 9. It may be argued that such a course would benefit every teacher who works in the Welsh-medium sector in Wales as they are necessarily involved in teaching pupils at various language levels. There is a clear role for English-medium secondary schools in the creation of a bilingual Wales and a populace confident in both languages. Such schools could profitably provide Welsh-medium teaching in some subjects for Welsh learners, and such teaching would provide a clear purpose for acquisition of the second language, transforming it into an active language in cognitive domains.

Subjects may be classified as follows:

It may be better to categorise subjects according to the way language is used within that subject area, and according to the relationship between that usage and non-linguistic support. Humanities would be retained for the upper level of second language subject area contact according to the following categories:

**Step 1: Practical subjects e.g. Physical Education, Technology, ICT, Art, Music**

These are the subjects that could be introduced initially to the learners who had a relatively poor grasp of the second language.

**Step 2: Subjects such as Mathematics and Science**

Subjects where the linguistic element is presented in short bursts leading to practice, application etc.

**Step 3: Humanities subjects such as Religious Education, Geography and History**

Subjects that require a high level of ability in the language of presentation, so that performance in that subject will not
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Any classification such as this has implications for both initial teacher training and professional development. Central planning needs to ensure that sufficient numbers of bilingual teachers, competent and confident in the use of Welsh within their subject, are being trained for the profession, particularly in the subjects listed under Step 1 (above). It appears that there is currently little coordination between the endeavour to use the education system to create a bilingual Wales (the aim incorporated in *Iaith Pawb*) and the planning that is necessary to ensure that secondary teachers are qualified to teach successfully within such a system.

In conclusion, therefore, three points need to be re-emphasised:

- Teaching Welsh as a second language within the National Curriculum in Wales has not been sufficiently successful – otherwise we would by now have reached a stage of self-sufficiency in terms of producing competent bilingual teachers in every subject.
- Improvements in second language learning, leading to a greater possibility to create a bilingual Wales, may be achieved by selectively teaching through the medium of Welsh within the English-medium sector in Wales.
- In order to pursue such a policy, sufficient numbers of secondary subject teachers need to be trained to be competent and confident, in both their oral and literary abilities, to teach parts of their subjects through the medium of Welsh. The scant attention given to Welsh-medium training in recent official reports is hardly worthy of our national status and the Welsh Assembly Government’s ambition to create a bilingual Wales.

Given the political will and with strong planning and leadership, that ambition can be realised. But it needs to be
underpinned by a comprehensive strategy, driven by a strong coordinating body.

**Acknowledgement**
The author benefited from the resources used at the Gwynedd Centre for Latecomers and discussions with the Centre’s lead-teacher, Mrs Carys Lake, to whom he is indebted.
Appendix
Staff Development Course LSCL\textsuperscript{2*}

| Course rationale | It is believed that:  
| (i) the success of the National Immersion Scheme depends largely on the understanding by subject teachers of language levels and the linguistic needs of this new and different cohort of pupils  
| (ii) the subject teaching strategies used with these pupils need to be different to those used with first language pupils  
| (iii) neither the initial training courses nor the staff development courses currently available in Wales (with the exception of the course provided by the Scheme's staff) provide an adequate lead  
| (iv) advantage needs to be taken of work in the USA in the field of LSCL\textsuperscript{2} adapting it to the position of Welsh in Wales in order to give confidence to teachers and the sector generally in the praiseworthy work that is being accomplished to try to reach the aim set by the Welsh Assembly Government to create a bilingual Wales. |
| Objective | To cooperate with a team of secondary subject teachers to provide a comprehensive course for future subject teachers involved with LSCL\textsuperscript{2}.  
| A further objective is to develop specialists from each school participating in the National Immersion Scheme. Consequently up to 4 subject teachers are invited from each school. |
| Content of the initial course | Sessions are held to cover the following:  
| • Introduction to the Staff Development Scheme and to the LSCL\textsuperscript{2} concept  
| • Introduction to 10 teaching strategies for subject teachers (scene-setting in a lesson; use of teaching sub-periods; integrating language skills; scaffolding techniques; graphic organisers; putting grammar in context; presenting meaningful input; maximising the quality of output; giving and receiving feedback with LSCL\textsuperscript{2} pupils; using the teaching strategies)  
| • Lesson planning and the value of graphic organisers  
| • Raising confidence in dealing with the second language (including accuracy, Welsh grammar, |
errors common to immersion pupils and how to deal with them)

- Pragmatism (i.e. language to cope with pragmatic situations, such as how to greet, thank, ask, refuse, apologise, praise, and complain) and consideration of the subject threshold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>(i) The course Director presents the above components and concepts with suitable examples (including some gleaned from a similar course, CoBaLT [Content-based Language Teaching with Technology] at the University of Minnesota)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Teachers are encouraged to adopt 2 or 3 of the teaching strategies (per term) as a basis for trialling them with their immersion classes, followed by their evaluation and adaptation. Development as research practitioners amending their own notes to conform with DCPI² provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Teachers are encouraged to contact the course Director to discuss developments and to visit classes where materials are being used and adapted etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) The same teachers (or at least those taking a lead role within each school) meet for one day each term (for at least 3 other terms) under the leadership of the course Director. The aim is to discuss the amended materials’ strengths and weaknesses and to offer new ideas. In time all these materials will form a comprehensive staff development pack for immersion teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Teachers, or those taking a lead role, are encouraged to run staff sessions within their own school with the assistance and support of the Director, if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Each termly meeting includes a session to raise the teachers’ linguistic confidence in the context of improving their pupils’ oral and writing accuracy and to discuss examples of lessons where language skills were used in a natural way in the class (i.e. the creation of natural opportunities to use language within subjects).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Outcome | To create a team across Wales of competent and confident specialists who could provide leadership in the event of the wider adoption of the philosophy and principles of the immersion scheme and LSCL² and the adoption of parts of LCSL² by English-medium schools. |

*Learning Subject Content through the medium of the Second Language
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